

# THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LI

JUNE, 1953

NO. 1086

## Catholics and UNESCO

GIUSEPPE ANGELO CARDINAL RONCALLI

*Apostolic Pro-Nuncio to France,  
Official Observer of the Holy See at UNESCO*

*Sermon preached at St. Pierre-de-Chaillot, Paris, before Delegates to the  
Seventh General Conference of UNESCO, November 12, 1952*

THE SUCCESS of the liturgical ceremony for UNESCO the first time it took place in this church of St. Pierre-de-Chaillot last year has encouraged us to repeat it at the beginning of the Conference which opens today. I believe that we are all pleased with the ceremony. The friendly harmony of honest and noble hearts striving together for the common good and the spiritual improvement of men, men that we all are here below, sons of men and sons of God, always bring precious rewards of joy and peace.

If there is any one special reason for our satisfaction on this new occasion, it is certainly the fact—brought to completion in recent months and

the fruit, shall I say, of mutual comprehension—of the official presence of a permanent observer of the Holy See, who, whether directly or through a prelate working in close collaboration with him and possessing his own special powers, will from henceforth have the honor and the opportunity of participating in this vast and complex enterprise, which enlists such powerful influences for the spread of education, science and culture in the interests of world peace.

I like to think that the presence of this observer marks an important stage in the work of UNESCO. For the unity of the Catholic Church, which spreads over the whole world, is itself a factor tending to link the

states in a greater political and cultural unity.

My own ideas on this subject draw inspiration and light from the words of the Holy Father himself who, quite recently, before a group of young delegates to a study congress organized by Italian Catholic Action on "Catholics and International Life," took note of the great progress achieved in international unity despite difficulties and obstacles of a psychological nature. He reminded his auditors of the obligations of vigilance and special effort incumbent on the Church and Catholics of different countries, faced by all this feverish preoccupation with technology, economics and politics which has arisen from the necessity of a common defense.

#### PIUS XII ON INTERNATIONALISM

"Catholics," said the Holy Father, "should live in this atmosphere." And he continued:

They are united in the richness of their faith, that which is for man the noblest, the most personal and the most important element in life, as well as by its influence on social and cultural life. From childhood Catholics are accustomed to regard all men, whatever their place of origin, their nationality or their color, as creatures of God, redeemed by Jesus Christ and called to an eternal destiny. They pray for all men and love all men. There is no other human group endowed with such profound, broad and favorable dispositions for international understanding.

A serious responsibility rests upon Catholics on this account. They should

above all feel themselves called upon to rise above themselves and to overcome their national feelings and to strive for fraternal union among the nations. We have already on many occasions remarked how necessary it is, if we do not want to prevent all *rapprochement* among the nations, to respect the sound cultural particularities of all peoples.

Such are the words and the teaching of the Pope.

Can we Catholics do anything better than to accept wholeheartedly this teaching and try to put it into practice in our relations with UNESCO?

The steps that we have made toward UNESCO since this promising institution appeared on the international scene have been in obedience to these directives. We intend to remain faithful to them. By our presence we seek to contribute something significant, constructive and inspiring.

In the stress of our intellectual effort on behalf of culture and in the fever of publications of all sorts, which each day assail us from the newsstands and store windows, inundating almost all the streets of this wonderful metropolis of Paris, and which penetrate to the whole world, stimulating similar floods of literary production in leading centers, it seems that one and the same cry is heard: "We must live in the current of history!" In other words: We must seek after novelties, whatever is modern or even bizarre, in

everything and at any price. As if the two thousand years of history behind us have nothing to teach us, as if the world during all that time was but in its infancy!

Let us acknowledge, those of us who are now getting old, with our knapsack of experience thrown over our shoulders, let us acknowledge, and not without smiling a little, the great good-will and boundless confidence in the future which our younger contemporaries possess.

Naturally, all of us here are in the current of history. But we must not become the victims of history, or allow ourselves to be overturned by it. Rather we must dominate it, and direct it towards the salvation, and not toward the destruction and shipwreck, of the world. Modern inventions and technology, their myriad applications to all aspects of life and human society—all this is useful and not to be neglected. But that is not enough, even for the temporal happiness of man, to say nothing of the eternal bliss of his immortal soul. Fortunately, the words and counsel of Christ, which the Church has gathered from His lips and treasured for twenty centuries, as she treasures them today, can be heard above this current so dangerous for those who recklessly throw

themselves into it. Jesus said to his closest friends: "You are the light of the world. You are the salt of the earth." Surpassing all the triumphs of human science, the gospel of Christ is still resplendent, containing within itself all the elements of civilization.

This is the faith of the Christian, of the Catholic. In cooperating with the work of UNESCO, the Catholic is not forgetful of this. From this source he draws inspiration for the consistency of his principles and the advancement of sincere, unperturbed and fraternal cooperation.

In its search for more practical and effective means of achieving its lofty ideals of education, science and universal culture, UNESCO will embark upon many varied and attractive paths. Often these will encounter, and even merge with, the most modern achievements of technology. And this will be a good thing. But they may also be absorbed therein to the point of seeming to lose intelligibility, or force or flavor. By means of his counsels and practical efforts, the Catholic will be able to contribute that wisdom, that energy, that seasoning, in a word, the salt of the earth, the evangelical salt of the Sermon on the Mount, which keeps alive the spontaneity, the savor which pre-

serves from corruption and which assures the permanence and the goodness of its successes.

Gentlemen, friends and brethren, I have spoken to you with simplicity and deference, from a confiding heart. I have brought these thoughts to the

altar as grains of incense, enveloping in their scent your prayers and mine. And now let us go about our glorious task. I hope with joy that it will be for you and me a source of great merit and a guarantee of all the blessings of heaven and earth.



### *Pope Pius XII*

In the life of the Church, Pope Pius XII will long be remembered for his masterly touch in every field of ecclesiastical activity. A catalogue of the many tasks to which he set himself would fill a column. His many addresses and letters have mirrored his brilliant mind and his Christ-like soul, as he strove to provide needed guidance on every pressing question of the day. The problems of war and peace he could meet, but he also could reach down into the personal lives of all, whether rich or poor, worker or employer, lawyer or doctor, student or professor, parents or children, married or unmarried—the Pope of all, he would meet the problems of all. His recent unprecedented move in changing the rules for the Eucharistic fast and in permitting evening Mass is evidence of his striking courage to meet changing conditions.—CATHOLIC STANDARD AND TIMES, *Philadelphia, Pa.*, Mar. 6, 1953.



### *Challenge from the South*

The new South is no longer clinging gracefully or ungracefully to ancient and outworn traditions. It is dynamic and expanding, growing in wealth and enterprise. Industrial developments and housing projects are spread over the landscape. The new South presents a host of social problems on which the Church has very definite views. Our Catholic attitude, for instance, on the evil of family restriction, and the Church's blessing on those conditions which enable people to rear large families affect our attitude on housing and on real estate. To demand a Christian consideration for the family as a unit of society, to require consideration for all families regardless of race: these things hang together and they indicate lines of action of the utmost importance.—*John LaFarge, S.J. in* INTERRACIAL REVIEW, *New York, N. Y.*, June, 1952.



## After Stalin

BY THE EDITORS

*Reprinted from the TABLET\**

THE best thing to hope for in the changes in Moscow after the death of Stalin would perhaps be the emergence of something that might correspond to Bevanism in this country—an increased influence, in other words, for the views represented by Voznesensky, whose condemnation was one of Stalin's last public interventions in Soviet affairs. This is the school of thought—necessarily very reticent in its public utterances in Moscow, however eloquent it may be in London—which would like to pay more attention to living standards at home, and correspondingly less attention to military strength.

In the long statement announcing Stalin's death there was an assurance that the production of consumer goods will not be forgotten under the new dispensation. It spoke of the "constantly growing material and cultural needs of the entire society," and declared that "the further improvement of the material well-being of all sections of the populace . . . has always been and always is a subject of particular solicitude on the part of the Communist Party and the Soviet Gov-

ernment." Malenkov likewise spoke at the funeral of his concern for living standards at home. There is, however, no reason to think of these remarks as more than signs that Stalin's successors are not only jealous of each other but unsure of themselves, and anxious to make the best impression.

It is too easy to build unsubstantial theories out of the available information. It would be dangerous, and perhaps disastrous, if a new legend should now begin to gain ground, in which it would be said that everything has changed with the death of Stalin; that, now the tyrant is gone and cannot bequeath his prestige, the threat to the world has been removed; and that Malenkov's use at Stalin's funeral of the old phrase about "peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition between two different systems, the Capitalist and the Socialist system," means that the tension has been relaxed and that Western vigilance can be relaxed as well.

It may be true, as John Foster Dulles has suggested, that the prospects for peace are better, but the

\* 128 Sloane St., London, S.W.1., England, March 14, 1953.

strength of the Soviet Union remains dedicated to the same purposes as before, and, save only for the passing of Stalin, power remains in the same hands. The truth may be that the prospects for peace are worse; that Stalin's was a moderating influence, increasingly ignored, as he grew older, by those who have now succeeded him. His own utterances on foreign policy, occasionally given, for instance, to American journalists, were singularly unlike leaders in *Pravda*, and were usually hopeful in tone. It may be that men even more ruthless than the Stalin of the last few years have now taken over. They have lost no time in sweeping away, according to an obviously prearranged plan, Stalin's measures for broadening the basis of the Government and Party leadership. They did this within twenty-four hours of his death. Power is concentrated now in the hands of five men.

### IS THERE FEAR INSIDE THE KREMLIN?

The statement announcing the political changes consequent upon Stalin's death included a phrase about "the prevention of any kind of disarray and panic." Inside the Kremlin at any rate some disarray and panic clearly existed, and a sense of dangers threatening the Soviet structure in this historic moment both internally and externally. Malenkov referred at the funeral to the "spirit of

political vigilance," "the spirit of intransigent and hard struggle against internal and foreign enemies." Those filled with the thesis about the aggressive nature of Western capitalism may well have thought that here was the moment when Western capitalism would suddenly and swiftly strike; those with special knowledge of the Ukraine, for instance, or of conditions in the Communist-dominated countries in Eastern Europe, may well have thought that here was a moment when risings might be attempted. Neither fear was well-founded, but both can easily be imagined in the strained atmosphere of the Kremlin following Stalin's death. At all events, no time was lost in announcing measures to ensure "the uninterrupted and correct leadership of the whole life of the country."

The effect of these measures was to sweep away the administrative structure set up only last October by the nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and to restore that of the war years. The same men who prosecuted the war, now ten years older, have brought back the Politburo, under another name. The key bodies constituted on October 16 last by the new Central Committee that had been selected two days before have now been scrapped.

Last October the new Central Committee, consisting of 125 members and 111 "substitutes," elected a new Praesidium of 25 members and 11

"candidates," as well as a new Secretariat of 10. The word Politburo, the symbol of the few ruling over so many, vanished from the scene, and the adjective "Bolshevik" disappeared from the title of the Party. But despite the continuance of these terminological concessions to public opinion, the old Politburo is now restored under another name.

#### PRAESIDIUM LINE-UP

Before last October's Congress there were 12 members of the Politburo, and there are now 10 members of the reformed Praesidium. In order of precedence, their names are Malenkov, Beria, Molotov, Voroshilov, Krushchev, Bulganin, Kaganovich, Mokoyan, Saburov and Pervukhin. A comparison of this new Praesidium with the old Politburo reveals that only the two last-named managers of State industries are newcomers. Andreyev and Kosygin have been dropped. Shvernik, who was a full member of the old Politburo and of the first 25-member Praesidium, becomes only a "candidate." So also do Ponomarenko, Melnikov and Baghirov—a Byelorussian, a Ukrainian and a Turk from Azerbaijan. Three members of the first Praesidium have obtained fresh positions in the State or Party administration, but 8, including Korotchenko, the Ukrainian "Premier," Kuusinen, the Karelo-Finnish Chairman of the Praesidium, Suslov and Shkiryatov, have been dropped

without any consolation prizes—although the first remains one of the Secretaries of the Central Committee and the last named probably remains Chairman of the Party Control Commission.

Krushchev, the strong man from the Ukraine, has been relieved of his duties as Secretary of the powerful Moscow party organization and has been succeeded there by a pupil of Malenkov—Mikhailov, former secretary-general of the Komsomol, or All-Union Lenin League of Communist Youth. Malenkov himself, whose second wife is Elena Khrushcheva, remains the Secretary-General of the Central Committee, but it seems that Khrushchev is to serve as chief party official under his son-in-law.

#### COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

The Soviet Council of Ministers is a cumbersome affair of many Deputy Chairmen (or "Vice-Premiers") and a few dozen Ministers. Before March 6, there were 13 Deputy Chairmen and 51 Ministers. Malenkov has decided, however, that four Deputy Chairmen are sufficient. These are now Beria, Molotov, Bulganin and Kaganovich, and these, together with Malenkov himself, the Big Five, the *piatiorka* of the Soviet Empire.

As long as Stalin lived, every enumeration of the Soviet leaders mentioned Molotov in the second place. He has returned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, succeeding Vyshin-

sky, who has lost not only his portfolio but also his position as a "candidate-member" of the party Praesidium. Molotov has been passed over for a leadership which, for a time at any rate, he must have expected to inherit. But he is probably too old and too *rond-de-cuir* to be a future center of rivalry.

### POLITICAL POLICE IN CONTROL

An event of obvious importance is the merging, under Beria, of the Ministries of Internal Affairs and of State Security. The three main elements in the Soviet State are the Party, the armed forces and the bureaucracy, and all three are permeated and controlled by the political police. Beria is, therefore, the man with whom it is most important for Malenkov to be on good terms.

When the Party is mentioned, it should be remembered that its huge membership of 6,013,259 members and 868,886 candidates at the time of last October's Congress is an unwieldy mass. A political plot is theoretically possible among some 44,000 party leaders, mainly the secretaries of the local and regional organizations, but no conspiracy could ever succeed without having the political police or the armed forces on its side.

The bureaucracy and the professional classes, described as the Soviet intelligentsia, number some ten or twelve millions, and represent, with their families, about a fifth of the

population of the Soviet Union. At the top are the managers, numbering about 800,000, the uniformed and bedadled aristocracy so similar to the Tsarist *chinovniki*. No serious political trouble is to be expected from the bureaucrats, because taking risks is not in their character.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union number some 4,600,000 men, including 1,100,000 of the "forces of the interior," the political police for which Beria, who is himself a Marshal of the Soviet Union, is responsible. There is an officers' corps of some 150,000. It is only in the Army that any fundamental changes could originate.

Stalin could purge the armed forces in 1937, sending Marshal Tukhachevsky and eight other prominent Generals to their death; but these were the leaders of a beaten Army—an Army that had been beaten by the Poles. Malenkov is hardly in a position to do the same thing with the Marshals who have been victorious in a war against Germany. He must take care to have the Army on his side.

An increase in the influence of the Red Army would probably be a good thing for the world. No soldiers like to be faced with the risk of an impossible war. The Marshals of the Red Army have seen Stalin's foreign policy unite the free world against their country and lead to the free world's rearmament on a massive scale. The voice of the Army might well be for

prudence. Yet too much should not be made of the return to Moscow of Marshal Zhukov, to become first Deputy Minister of War. It is by no means certain that he has spent the past seven years in disfavor. His return, moreover, is accompanied by the political demotion of another Marshal, Vasilevsky, who becomes another of the Deputy Ministers. A political Marshal, Bulganin, a former *chekist*, has returned to the post of Minister of War, over Zhukov. Marshal Voroshilov, it is true, has risen to what is officially the highest position in the State, but he too is a party-soldier primarily, without much military glory; he failed lamentably on the southern front in 1941.

It still remains, however, that the heads of the armed forces have a very much more powerful voice in the home and foreign affairs of the Soviet Union than they did before the second World War.

#### COMMUNIST CHINA AND RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The important place which Communist China occupies in Russian foreign policy has been recognized by the appointment of M. Kuznetsov as Soviet Ambassador to Peking. Unlike M. Panyushkin, his predecessor, he is not a career diplomat but an engineer, hitherto the chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions. He remains one of three Deputy Foreign Ministers, which means that he will

be in a position to make policy decisions.

Malenkov spoke in his funeral oration of his "eternal friendship with the great Chinese people" and "with the workers of all the countries of people's democracies." The order of priority is clear. China comes before the satellite States. When the Chinese-Soviet agreement was signed, in February, 1950, some months before China's entry into the Korean war, Mao Tse-tung was given delegated responsibility for the conduct of Soviet policy in the Far East. He accepted Marshal Stalin's revolutionary leadership, and, in return, received concessions in Manchuria and a written promise from the Soviet Union not to interfere in internal Chinese affairs. The alliance is primarily dictated by mutual interests, and it is China which depends on the Soviet Union for material assistance, a dependence that will be tightened when the Anglo-American agreement to restrict the flow of strategic materials becomes effective.

The total amount of Chinese imports from non-Communist countries in 1952 was estimated at about \$280 million. They included cotton from Pakistan and Egypt, rubber from Ceylon and Indonesia, and chemicals and medical supplies from some countries in Western Europe. Some smuggling of munitions and fuel is also going on. These imports are not very large, but their loss will nevertheless

be felt, and will act as a binding motive in the maintenance of the Soviet alliance.

But the fundamental difference between these two monolithic powers will not be entirely bridged by the dictates of necessity. Mao's revolution was achieved by the unorthodox action of the peasantry, not by that of an industrial proletariat or by a bourgeois ascendancy as Stalin had predicted. Stalin's recommendations were to collaborate with the Kuomintang of Chiang Kai-shek. When the latter was kidnapped by Chang Hsueh-liang, at Sian in December, 1936, Marshal Stalin sent a telegram to the Communists at Yenan, in which he warned of the chaos in China which the action might provoke, whereupon the Generalissimo was released.

Stalin was always dutifully praised as the man who had made possible the Chinese revolution, and Mao, writing in *Pravda* on March 10, said that "the road which our Chinese revolution will have to follow is the Soviet road." But it also was "Stalin and Mao," a phrase no Gottwald, Pieck or Bierut would have dared to use. The pictures of both leaders were always shown together on plat-

forms and in the press. With Stalin gone, it should prove even more difficult for the Chinese Communists to resist placing their own hero in the first place than it will be for some Communist leaders of the old guard in Eastern Europe, with the economies of their countries at the mercy of the Soviet Union, and with much popular discontent, to accept Mr. Malenkov, their inferior in years and prestige.

The Stalin myth was one of the most effective means of binding the satellite countries and world Communism to the Soviet Union. Malenkov, praised last week by Marshal Beria as "the talented pupil of Lenin and the faithful follower of Stalin," belongs, after all, to a second generation of revolutionaries, used to giving and receiving orders in an atmosphere where unquestioning obedience is the norm. Stalin's personality, his career before the revolution, his imprisonment and exile, his closeness to Lenin, his victories inside and outside Moscow, constituted a myth which exhibited him as a demi-god and father of his people. *Le roi est mort; vive le roi*. But the question remains whether Malenkov can elicit the same devotion and self-sacrifice as his master.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Shortly after this article was written, Nikita S. Khrushchev became General Secretary of the Communist party. According to the official announcement, Malenkov was replaced in this key post "at his own request." What this shift means has since been the source of much speculation.—EDITOR.

# Menace of Communism

MANNING JOHNSON

*Investigator, Department of Immigration*

*An address delivered at Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart,  
Purchase, N. Y., Feb. 25, 1953.*

**T**HE threat of Communism is familiar to me. My familiarity with the subject differs from yours in that it springs from personal knowledge and experience acquired during the ten years that I was a member and national leader of the Communist Party.

Well known to you, I am sure, is it that the aim of Communism is the total destruction of the political, social, economic and religious beliefs and institutions in which our civilization is rooted, and the establishment of a world Communist society on the ruins. It is well known to you, too, that Communism is the theory, the strategy and the tactics of class, race and political warfare, of civil war, rebellion and revolution; and that this theory, strategy and tactics have been developed into a so-called "science of class warfare and revolution." Moreover, all the accumulated experience of the world in rebellion, civil war and revolution serve as the basis of all the past, present and future activities of the Communist Party.

It is well known to you, finally,

that the victory of Communism in Russia gave Communism a base of operation from which world revolution could be organized and directed. Backed by a powerful state, rich in natural resources and manpower, swollen by conquest, the foreign sections of the Russian Communist Party, steeled, disciplined, loyal, trained and determined, work like the imps of Satan to bring all humanity under the iron heel of the Soviet dictatorship.

Since all these facts are fully known to you, I shall relate only those personal experiences that provide a picture of how Communism leads to moral decay, to spiritual death as well as physical slavery. To do this I shall tell how I got into the Communist Party; why; what I discovered; my frustration and disillusionment; my abandonment of Communism; and my return to the ranks of Christian democracy.

Permit me first to give you a little about my background. I was born in our Nation's Capital. I was reared in a Christian home. My parents were God-fearing people who instilled in



me patriotism, and love of God and humanity. They taught me to live according to the Golden Rule. Spiritual as well as material values were equally stressed to balance my training.

### CULTURE AND SOCIAL LIFE

My mother held that "the body needs nourishment and care and so does the soul." Consequently regular church attendance was a must. I grew to love the church. In it I found spiritual joy, happiness and a chance to develop and use my talents. A boy or girl who could sing, play an instrument, orate, or recite found an outlet in the church. Recitals, debates, group singing and forums served as a splendid cultural medium, developed talent, broadened one's outlook and created a deep sense of values. The atmosphere of our surroundings was so infectious that the most backward children were drawn into active participation. Indeed, the church was the center of religious, cultural and social life—a power for good in the community.

My parents were poor hard-working people. They toiled from early morning until late at night, at great personal sacrifice, to eke out a living for a large family and to give all the children at least a high-school education. The going was really tough for them. There were times when there was not enough to go around, but whatever there was we

shared in simple faith. After school I did odd jobs to add to the family income. In fact, mother and all the children had to work because race prejudice restricted my father to the more menial, low-paying and hazardous jobs.

Born and reared as I was in Jim-Crow Washington, I developed a bitterness and resentment against unjust race relations. A Negro youth matures early in his understanding of race relations in a Jim-Crow atmosphere. From birth to maturity and the grave he feels the screws of unjust restrictions. The insults, the abuses, the harsh and cruel realities of race prejudice constantly engage his thoughts. Often I would seek the silence of the wooded sections of Washington where I could escape from the oppressive atmosphere of my surroundings. There I could forget my plight in the matchless beauty and loveliness of God's creation.

When I graduated from high school, I was full of enthusiasm and hope. But race conditions disturbed me greatly. They had disturbed me all through my youth. My parents had taught me to believe that good character, education, ability and observance of the Golden Rule would enable me to surmount the mountainous obstacle of race prejudice. Given half a chance I was convinced that I could make my way in any community. The big question in my mind was, "how will I get half a chance



in the face of entrenched race prejudice with all its horrible restrictions?" The question was answered in subsequent experiences which deepened and sharpened my resolve to combat race prejudice. How? I did not know.

### JOINS COMMUNIST FRONT

It was in the course of my search for a way to combat the sin of race prejudice that I was attracted to Communism through a deceptive front organization called the American Negro Labor Congress. The patriotic name, the appealing program of unity of white and Negro Americans to win equal rights for the Negro appealed to me. It recalled to my mind the abolitionist who fought so successfully against great odds for the end of chattel slavery.

In my young and inexperienced mind I hailed these people as modern-day liberators. To myself I said: "This is it!" Little did I dream that I was joining a Communist front organization and that I was embarking upon a course that would lead to frustration, disillusionment, desperation and despair. Little did I dream that I would have to fight my way back to Christian democracy, and that this fight would be the toughest of my life.

Taken in as I was by the attractive program of this front organization, I saw only the ideal—the beautiful garment of equality. I willingly and

cheerfully accepted the advice and counsel of the leaders on how best to bring it about. I plunged into the activities with enthusiasm and zeal. My talent for public speaking, which I developed in church and school, made me very much in demand. The leaders helped me prepare my speeches, by supplying me with the outlines. The popularity that I soon gained in the community and among the people was like heady wine. Before I was aware of it I was speaking, acting and thinking like a Communist. The next step was membership in the Communist Party.

When I joined the Communist Party, I did not know anything about it. I was told only that the Party advocated the same program as the American Negro Labor Congress, and that I would be given special training in the Party schools to better equip me for national leadership in the movement for Negro rights. The prospect of training for national leadership and organized backing sold me on the Party. The motives behind all this never occurred to me.

Breaking the chains of racism was my one resolve; getting rid of them the only obstacle that stood in the way of the life that I sought, not only for myself, but for my race. The end result was to me worth any price that was exacted from me and my generation. At least one generation should be willing to offer itself as a sacrifice that successive generations could live

in a society free from restrictions based upon race.

The glib, smooth answers to all race problems impressed me. Indeed, my tutors had a ready answer and explanation for everything. World affairs leaped like lightning from their tongues. They turned from conditions of the lowly sharecropper in the delta to conditions of the natives of South Africa with an ease that amazed me. The world seemed at their finger tips. I took it all in. When I repeated what I learned from them, I stood out among my fellows.

### RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS

The only obstacle to my being a real Communist was my strong religious convictions. I was bluntly told that I had to get rid of them. I vehemently argued against leaving God out of the Cause because without Him the cause would fail. At first I thought that atheism was the opinion of the few leaders with whom I was associated, and not the opinion or policy of the whole Party. Having made unmistakably clear my religious convictions, I thought that would end all their efforts to convert me to atheism. Instead it made them more determined than ever. I was like an enemy in the camp. I was eyed with suspicion. My invocations of God's help provoked sneers and ridicule from the comrades. I suffered in silence, attributing their reactions to ignorance.

From time to time we engaged in

political discussions that somehow always wound up on the subject of the church and religion, the purpose being to indoctrinate me in the Communist position. I was given a pamphlet on religion written by V. I. Lenin, leader of the Bolshevik Revolution and founder of the world organization of Communism. In this pamphlet he goes to great lengths to show that religion is the opiate of the people, and that man made God, not God man. I was also given other pamphlets written by the renegade Protestant Bishop Brown, in which he calls for (I quote): "Banishment of Gods from the heavens and capitalists from the earth" and for the "science of Moscow against the superstitions of Rome."

I listened to all the arguments against the church and religion. I read all the pamphlets. But my faith remained unshaken. Since atheism is the avowed belief of all Communists, how is it, you may ask, that I held on to my religious views and still remained in the Party?

I committed the sin of hiding my religious convictions while pretending to accept the Communist position. To you this may seem strange because you have never experienced the change that comes over a man when he becomes wrapped up in a cause that means everything to him. And at the time the Cause meant everything to me. It was bigger than any individual, irrespective of his opin-

ions of the church or religion. Moreover, I had learned the Communist policy of saying one thing and doing another.

Having committed this grievous sin I was ready for thorough Communist indoctrination and training. It was like a break in the dike of my faith. The attitude and opinion of the comrades changed. I was one of them. I was sent to the secret National Training School where I was given an extensive and intensive course in revolutionary theory, strategy and tactics to convert me into a professional revolutionist.

#### TAUGHT HATRED OF THE SOCIAL SYSTEM

There I was taught to hate the social system. In all the lectures and reading material it was the whipping boy. It was the social system that was responsible for the Negro's plight. It was the social system that was responsible for crises and war. It was the social system that was responsible for colonial oppression. The social system, in short, was responsible for everything but the inclement weather. And the only solution was to change the system, and that is the historic task of the Communist Party. Soviet Russia was held up as a shining example of what could be done once capitalism was destroyed. Crises would end, men would war no more, Negroes would enjoy full equality, and milk and honey

would be had by all in the Soviet utopia.

At the time, the 1929 economic crisis was nearing its peak. Bank failures, foreclosures, evictions, lengthening breadlines, increasingly sharp race antagonisms because of the scarcity of jobs, a glutted market, want in the midst of plenty—all this gave strength to the Communist attack on our social system. In the light of prevailing conditions I was convinced more than ever that the system must be destroyed. Thus when I graduated from the Party training school, I was full of hate—hate against capitalists, their government and their supporters. I went forth determined to use every grievance of the Negro, the worker, the farmer, the foreign-born and the youth to arouse rage against the social system and “mold it into talents and energies to be put in the service of the revolution.”

Hate is the opposite of Christian charity. As such, it is the opposite of all that I had learned and in which I believed before I became a Communist. The belief that mass hate aroused, organized and skilfully directed is alone able to change the course of history replaced my belief in the power of Christianity.

During the years following my transformation I toiled untiringly to overthrow the Government of the United States. The triumph of Communism in America and throughout

the world meant everything to me. I abandoned home, church, relatives and friends for the Cause. I said and did everything I was told. I went everywhere the Party sent me, even if I landed in jail. I was a loyal and disciplined leader.

### DISCARDS CHRISTIAN MORALITY

Christian morality I gradually discarded as excess baggage. For me, like all Communists, there is only one morality and that is the morality that serves class warfare and revolution. The end justifies the means. As Stalin put it: "We do not lament the loss of the hair of one who has been beheaded" in order to advance the cause of Communism. Lie; use all kinds of artifices, deceptions; betray confidences; steal or do any other unscrupulous thing in order to advance the cause.

The fine Christian attributes that I had when I joined the Party were in time almost completely destroyed. These attributes are abhorred and called "sentimental garbage" by Communists. Any member found harboring them is scathingly denounced and eyed with suspicion. Ridding one's self of passions and sympathies is essential because a professional revolutionist must be cold, merciless, calculating and ruthless. He must never be ruled by sentiment, for that is to court disaster for the Communist conspiracy.

It was by this evil code—the code

of Communism—that I lived for ten years. I was cold and ruthless, doing things, not out of love of humanity or of God, but out of the harsh and cruel necessities of the Cause. I could smile when necessary, and voice injustice and express shock at the inequities and ills of our social system, but all this I did for effect. Good acting, I call it—acting that impressed, won confidence and enabled me to subvert and sink the claws of the Party in the masses. The farmer, the worker, the Negro, the liberal, the clergy, the idealist, the humanitarian were important only to the extent that they could be used to bring about the victory of Communism. The moral depths to which I had fallen may be seen in the fact that during the Moscow purge trial I supported Stalin. More than that, I had not the slightest pity for the victims.

### HITLER-SOVIET PACT

In 1939, August to be precise, the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed. There had been rumors that such a pact was being negotiated, but the Party leaders denied it, asserting that the Soviet leaders would not be a party to such a thing. Even when the news of the Pact was published in the *New York Times*, the leaders refused to believe because no word had come from Moscow. When the news became official, the Party leaders hastened to defend the Pact.

I was shocked and dismayed, as

were many other members of the Party. I could no longer go along in all faith with the Party. My confidence was shaken to its foundation by what I considered a wicked betrayal of the world anti-fascist front that I had helped so much in building. The belief that Stalin could do no wrong was shattered beyond repair. The grip that Communism had upon me began to loosen, the mental straightjacket ripping at the seams. For the first time I was seriously examining my experiences over the years and I did not like what I found.

#### EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE

I recalled my pre-Communist days when I was young, strong, zealous, possessed of fine passions and sympathies and determination to work for equal rights for my race. I had sought the solution of the race problem through Communism, only to wind up forced to admit that I was wrong. My labors had not been in the interest of the Negro, but in the interest of the leaders in the Kremlin.

I had served as a tool to win Negro support of Soviet policy and to bring Negroes under the authoritarian and hierarchical control of Stalin. I had used deceit, trickery, guile and lies to gain objectives. I had made use of attractive programs to exploit the idealist, to snare the unwary, the gullible, the unsuspecting, the liberal and the naive. I had exploited the deep religious convictions of the people, their

aspirations and tender yearnings for peace—all this and more I had done for the Cause. As a result of all these flagitious activities I had become morally corrupt, a living example of what Communism does to the soul of man.

There had been times when I would not have entertained such thoughts, when I would have dismissed them as treason. This was different. I was frustrated and disillusioned and disgusted with myself. Yet, the ties that bound me to the Party were not easily broken. I did a lot of thinking over a period of several months before I finally abandoned Communism.

Why I departed from the original course charted by good parents and joined the ranks of the apostles of hate may not be clear to you who have known no other way of life, and have not experienced the handicaps of discrimination and segregation that face the young Negro American. Try for a moment to put yourself in my place. Picture yourself up against the restrictions of race prejudice, insults, abuse, slurs and often mayhem and lynching. Ask yourself, if you were a Negro what you would do.

Ever since I came out of the jungle of Communism, I have sought to capture or regain my Christian faith. But here is the strange thing. Ideals and principles, even regard for truth, put aside for ten years are not easily recovered. Remember that for ten years I worked with some degree of

success to eradicate the fine training of my youth and to put in its place hate, suspicion, distrust, contempt for compassion and sympathies, a conviction that the end justifies the means. Though I had resolved not to abandon my religion, all this could not but weaken my faith.

#### GOD AND COUNTRY

Thank God, I am free now and slowly regaining the ideals that I neglected or buried. Now I feel that I stand with you, devoted to the love of God and country.

I am going to make a few suggestions that we as Americans and Christians can carry out together:

1. Continue to expose Communism at all times.
2. Build social and interracial justice.
3. Remove injustices which tempt good Americans to turn in desperation and frustration to Communism.

We will not succeed in checking Communism by pursuing one course alone. All three of these courses are essential.

My closing words relate to the unfinished work of democracy. Despite the recent gains of the American Negro, a great deal more has to be done to expand and develop our Christian democracy, to the end that all rights, duties and privileges of de-

mocracy become the heritage of all irrespective of race or color.

Your church, its leaders, Catholic organizations have done a great deal to promote racial justice. The Interracial Councils and the Catholic Committee of the South, cooperating with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban League, are doing a splendid job. I can remember when Catholics were conspicuous by their absence in this struggle, but I am happy to say that those days have passed and that they are now among the best fighters on this critically important battle-line.

I know of the fine ideals and precepts exemplified by your college. I hope that these will remain a challenge to all of you when you take your place among the educated men and women of tomorrow. You can do much in your parishes and in your communities in the years ahead. We must all work together, Catholic, Jew, Protestant, Negro and white. We must contend for the right. There will be family, social and community pressures to maintain the *status quo*, but we must stand firm, resisting all pressures, fully cognizant that we are fighting in favor of God, religion, freedom, justice and charity against the sinister forces that would destroy all these and build a world of chaos, slavery and hate.

# Huxley's Hodgepodge

THE REV. G. J. GUSTAFSON

*Reprinted from the PRIEST\**

**W**E were both somewhat amused and somewhat annoyed to note that Julian Huxley is still harping away on his old theme, the current need of a natural and man-made religion. The press, religious and secular, carried a release recently that at Amsterdam, to a world congress on Humanism and Ethical Culture, he had once more expounded his now somewhat shopworn creed, Evolutionary Humanism.

It is essentially "religion without dogma" that he would have; but it is soon seen to bristle with dogmas — Huxley's own. He once (1927) called it "Religion without Revelation" in a rather longish exposition of this pet idea — to which Ronald Knox retorted, "Religiosity without Reason would have been a more apt christening."

It does in fact embrace most of the modern dogmas of his particular set: birth control, divorce, the worship of science, the special preeminence of Darwinian evolution (as espoused so ably and persistently by grandfather T. H.), the social efficiency of eugenics, atheism, casualism, the pseudo-mystical worship of biology, the increasing intrusion of the state into the field of education and human welfare.

If any professional student of the history of religion ever bothers to examine the hodgepodge, he will recognize at once that Julian Huxley stands to it not as an inventor but as a systematizer. He found the materials ready at hand; his contribution is chiefly to label them (having set them down in some order) as "Religion." Many of the elements, in fact, which he would utilize for the construction of his "brave new world" have already been tested and found wanting by his own brother, Aldous, who used the very phrase as title for a savage satire.

Nor is it any novelty for Julian Huxley to propose a new religion. His model here is probably Auguste Comte, the founder of Sociology, which, as he understood it, and as few have understood it since, was offered in the guise of religion. Comte saw clearly the pressing need of a religious drive and devotion. So too did a disillusioned Renan after he found that

\*Huntington, Indiana, November, 1952.



Science had failed to renew the face of the earth. Huxley's own great-uncle, Matthew Arnold, was keenly aware of the role of the religious attitude towards life. He characterized the England of his day, not without reason, as "a civilization with many virtues but without lucidity and without largeness of temper." Without faith himself, he wanted his fellow countrymen to cast their lot "boldly with the sages and the saints."

Huxley does not speak much of the saints, unfortunately; and he has implied that the model sage is, of course, himself. Wrapping his mantle about him, he has said gnominically that the purpose of his scientific humanism is "to have life and have it more abundantly." (Isn't there something familiar about that, Doctor? An echo of Darwin, perhaps?) As for the saints, well, they are so definitely Christian, you know; and Christianity no longer belongs.

"The Christian ethic and Christian doctrine," he once wrote, "though they have left an indelible mark on our Western civilization in their insistence on the overriding value of the individual personality, on the necessity for sacrifice, and in many other ways, are no longer either a primary or an essential part of its framework. New attitudes, new values, new needs have come into being." Of these new attitudes, values and needs he is the self-appointed and tireless propagandist.

### HUXLEY'S PHILOSOPHY, NOT UNESCO'S

UNESCO, whose first Director General he was, he would have used as a schoolroom for the dissemination of such ideas. He provided it with a sixty-two page pamphlet, *UNESCO, Its Purposes and Its Philosophy*.

This turned out to be rather Huxley's purpose and philosophy. True, the pamphlet had no official sanction but it bore the name of the Director General, and it caught the attention of many, often to the detriment of UNESCO. We were just then all wondering what UNESCO might turn out to be, a little doubtfully, a little fearfully. We doubted and we feared the more thereafter. True, too, that a wise and practical suggestion by Jacques Maritain came to offset the implication that Huxley was to set the philosophical tone of the strange new international bureau to educate the world. Maritain cited the impossibility of speculative agreement "on the same concept of man, of man's knowledge, or of the world" and urged instead "the affirmation of a single body of beliefs for guidance in action." He appears to have carried the day. . . .

But to return to the man and the philosophy. How can Julian Huxley be so naive or so credulous as to think that he can impose a potpourri of



scientific facts, pseudo-scientific allegations, mere materialistic hypotheses, unfounded hopes and outright errors on the peoples of the world in the name of a new religion?

Comte failed. Renan failed. Matthew Arnold failed. Huxley will fail, too. There can be no religion without revelation, without a foundation, real or imaginary, in the supramundane (we do not say supernatural because of the distinctive overtones of the term). This would seem to be a fact quite conclusively attested to by history. Nor need Huxley go far back into the mists: the case of Renan, so like his own, is close at hand and something of a *cause célèbre*.

"It is you who are the sceptics and we the believers," Renan wrote to the critical-minded of his day. "We believe in the work of modern times, in its sanctity, in its future, and you blaspheme it. We believe in humanity and its divine destiny and you laugh at it; we believe in the dignity of man, in the goodness of nature, the rectitude of his heart, in his right to the attainment of perfection, and you shake your heads at these consoling truths and prefer to dwell on the dark side of things." This is the optimism of Huxley, too. Substitute Darwin and Freud and the power of state education for whatever gods Renan worshipped in his religion of science and the picture is the same.

### THE ARCHETYPE

Whether or not the final pessimism of Renan will descend upon Huxley remains to be seen. Here it is, though, in the archetype as expressed forty years later: "It seems possible that the collapse of supernatural belief will be followed by the collapse of moral convictions and that the moment when humanity sees the reality of things will mark a real moral decline. Under the influence of illusions the good gorilla succeeded in making an astonishing moral effort. Remove the illusions and a part of the factitious energy that they aroused will disappear. If you take away the working man's beer, you must not expect to get the same amount of work out of him." And again, "We are living on the perfume of an empty vase."

It is interesting to speculate on the sources of Huxley's implied confidence in his ability to create and impose a new religion on the modern world in spite of the failures of his forebears. One may hazard a guess in advance that he failed to appreciate their failures. Not having much knowledge of religion themselves, having been taught to view it under the light of materialistic anthropology and comparative religion, or Freudian psychology, he and his fellows are not likely to comprehend its unique

nature and its inimitable driving power. Failing to see, as Dawson points out in *The Judgment of Nations*, that the modern world is sick almost unto death precisely from a starvation and frustration due to the absence of any real religion, Huxley and his fellow humanists and ethical culturists cannot gauge the enormous scope of the task they lightheartedly attempt. Men ask for the bread of life and they are tossed a stone.

Julian Huxley stands before the world as a scientist. What has science to offer? In a down-to-earth examination of its humanistic pretenses Norman Foerster in his *American Criticism* could only find it seriously wanting. Speaking of Walt Whitman, who incidentally could do more with his "barbaric yawp" than Huxley with his pale abstractions, Foerster sums up quite moderately what modern science teaches about man:

Our present science lends little support to an inherent "dignity of man" or to his "perfectibility." It is wholly possible that the science of the future will lead us away from democracy towards some form of aristocracy. The millennial expectations that Whitman built upon science and democracy, we are now well aware, rested upon insecure foundations. . . . The perfection of nature, the natural goodness of man, "the great pride of man in himself" offset with an emotional humanitarianism — these are the materials of a structure only slightly colored with modernity. His politics, his ethics, his religion belong to the past, even that facile "religiousness" which we hoped would suffuse and complete the work of science and democracy. . . . In the essentials of his prophecy, Whitman, we must conclude, has been falsified by the event.

Whitman, in a word, Renan's word, lived on the perfume of an empty vase.

### NOTHING SCIENTIFIC

Julian Huxley, we have said, stands before the world as a scientist. What is scientific about this new religion of his? Absolutely nothing! It is not only that religion does not lie within the purview of science but that Huxley has himself wandered quite far beyond its bounds. What has happened?

Morris Cohen has ventured the opinion that in the public mind "the scientist has taken the place formerly held by the priest, as one having access to absolute truth or omniscience." He adds, more relevantly to our purposes, that "with regard to the nature of the scientific method scientists themselves are not always possessed of clear and sound ideas," the proof being "the character of their utterances on politics, religion and all sorts of other issues." When one ventures into the field of the so-called "social sciences," the danger becomes intensified, for "students of social science are interested not only in facts of existence but in promoting certain more or less partisan purposes."

The very use of the term, social science, tends to produce, in his opinion, "a pretension that is not justified and therefore inimical to the very spirit of science." There is an indecent rush connected with these pursuits that clashes with the impersonality of true science and its cold indifference to immediate objectives beyond the larger question of truth. One may easily become a prey to his own emotions, patriotism or pride or fear or the will to win, as exemplified by the professors under the Nazi heel who preached sheer nonsense in the name of anthropology, or the Soviet puppets who oppose Lysenko to Mendel and Morgan under the influence of Stalin — "that man whose penetrating eye and genius corrects our errors in all our activities — in the political sphere, in the economic life, in the field of science" (the President of the Soviet Academy of Science, August 26, 1948).

We think that Julian Huxley has fallen into this trap. He has come to share public opinion about the role of the scientist as savior; he has forgotten to employ the care he must certainly exercise in his own specialty, biology, the patience necessary, the disinterestedness and the prudence. He has had a taste of glory as a prophet; he has found that he can command audiences who share his own unscientific prejudices; he can write books that create a stir in that small world of his; he can see himself haranguing in Amsterdam or in Sauk Center and find his remarks repeated in the *New York Times*. He has, as they say, "gone hog-wild." But he will never create a religion. These dead bones of fact and alleged fact shall not live.

The pity of it all is that he cannot be dismissed merely as another wild-eyed enthusiast. Though his attempt at rousing religion is ludicrous in fact, his insistence on the use of public power to propagate ideas which he and too many other "intellectuals" find fascinating is no crude joke.

Our "moral certitudes," he feels, can and should be manipulated at will by an organized society — "Society must make rational use of an irrational mechanism to create the system of values it wants," he once wrote; for, after all, in his view, "the human individual is quite strictly meaningless in isolation; he only acquires significance in relation to some form of society." He would have the world made to realize "that proper social organization can be made to promote, and is indeed the only adequate means of promoting, both the degree and variety of individuation among the members of society." Science and government combine to rule the world they have first of all made.

This is not a pretty picture, nor is it of any avail for Mr. Huxley to

decry the evils of totalitarianism. This is totalitarianism; the very stuff of which it is made. He is indeed describing rather well what went on in pre-war Japan, or in Nazi Germany and Italy, or what is taking place before our eyes in present-day Russia.

One need only look back on the "confessions" of martyrs to Communist oppression, wrung out of them when they were reduced to a kind of pulp and robbed of their distinctive human faculties of intellect and free-will, to see how the state can utilize an "irrational mechanism," in Huxley's own words, "to create the system of values it wants." The technique begins with a fairly simple kind of psychology, the use of the crude lie again and again, in the Nazi fashion, and ends with the utilization of horrifying devices we in the West do not yet quite understand, which batter down the last stronghold of personality and make of what was a man an amorphous mass to be shaped at will by a commissar. A victim is robbed, thus, even of the glory of martyrdom — he is made a mockery of himself. Only God can see deep within the poor imbecile, who mutters preposterous lies and betrays his trust woodenly, the vestiges of a man who has made the heroic act of love of Him.

No, thank you, Mr. Huxley! Keep your panacea to yourself.



### Classical Music

Dozens of people tell us they *can't understand* so-called classical music. That's just ridiculous. It might sound unfamiliar at first, but you can certainly get to like it. It was written solely to be a source of pleasure, and if it doesn't please an open-minded audience, it just doesn't live in immortality. Audiences would be insane to sit through Beethoven's music for thirteen decades if it didn't make them glad that they were hearing him. The music of the bushy-haired masters and their modern successors may be complex, but so is driving a car or getting through a revolving door. We *can learn*, even if we *are* college students. Everybody has been singing fragments of the "great" musicians all along; dozens of popular juke-box numbers have been snatched bodily from operas and symphonies. And don't let anybody tell you that you can hear the great music on radios or TV sets. You have to go to the Lyric in person and feel the house rock with thunderous melody before you can say: "*This is music!*" We have no complaint against popular ballads; we only say that the classical music is made by men of mighty talent, while disc jockey numbers come from the skilled, but uninspired tunesmith. It's the difference between sandlot and Yankee Stadium, between hamburger and porterhouse.—*The GREYHOUND, Loyola College, Baltimore, Md., Jan. 23, 1953.*

# Marriage and the Family in Irish Life

SEAN DE CLEIR

*Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX\**

**A**T A time when the institutions of Christian Marriage have been repudiated by most of the dominant elements in our Western civilization, we in Ireland have not yielded one iota of our loyalty to that great sacrament. We admit of no divorce. Contraception we proclaim for the evil thing it is. The rights of parents in education are maintained in our Constitution. In self-sacrificing devotion to their duties our married people set an example to the West. This is a record in which we have cause for an honest pride. But it is also a record in which there lurks a grave danger. For this our admirable loyalty to the Sacrament of Matrimony and to the Catholic home masks our sad betrayal of the family as the first society, the cradle of our nation, the basis of our State.

How have we betrayed the family? We have betrayed it largely by sins of omission; on the part of a great many individuals amongst us by a failure to answer the call to married life. For in Ireland, both in town and country, the rate of celibacy is abnormally high. In the rural areas,

clearly defined classes of men are for all practical purposes totally celibate. Amongst others the failure takes the form of answering the call so late in life as to frustrate in some measure the great object of marriage, the continuance of the race. Amongst land-owners as a class marriage is normally postponed until prime is past. In effect the number of families living on the land is equated to the number of agricultural holdings. Non-marrying and late marrying force the young women to forsake the countryside. The child population of the rural areas has suffered a dreadful decline. It is no exaggeration to say that the decay of the rural population threatens the life of the nation.

Again we betray the family when we permit the urbanization of our people to proceed in a manner dictated by the interests of the industrialists, the speculative builders and their financiers, which is detrimental to the best interests of the family and of the nation. The urbanization of our people is progressing at an alarming rate and it is progressing without adequate reference to the

\*Main St., Nasse, Ireland, October, 1952

ideals of Christian family life. In the towns and cities housing is scarce and very dear. Rentals or house-purchase repayments absorb such a high proportion of the family income that it is impossible to make adequate provision for education, confinements and ill-health. In this way a demand for free services is created which an over-zealous bureaucracy can supply only by undermining the independence of the family.

The typical modern house provided for the working-class family is so small as to discourage the development of a normal home life. Admittedly the new housing estates are an improvement on the old slums. But just as clearly they are being thrown up in answer to the dictates of an unrelieved commercialism. These houses are being built to a price without ever a pause to consider if they measure up to what should be the minimum requirements of family housing.

There are many disturbing facets of this problem, all of which indicate that too little thought is being given to the true welfare of the families for whom the houses are provided. The houses are being set down miles away from the father's place of work. Transport charges become a second rent. Long hours of absence from the home prevent the exercise of fatherly care. An unnatural divorce is effected between the father's working life and his life at home.

Again huge numbers of children are congregated in areas where it is practically impossible to make adequate provision for their education. As a direct consequence of the smallness of the houses, hordes of children are set loose to play on the roadways where the bad influence of a few immoral homes can spread like a contagion. The segregation of the social classes into rigidly demarcated zones exaggerates class distinctions, tends to reduce the whole environment of the working-class home to one of unrelieved drabness and even ugliness, and gives to these big housing schemes the character of a barrack quarter, which is depressing and may well be demoralizing.

#### FAMILY WELFARE

The official attitude to the family, as revealed in proposed or enacted legislation, bears a strong taint of Socialism. It seems that direct action by the State is the only answer to any problem, no matter how intimately that problem may concern the individual or the family. No effort is made to throw the responsibility for family welfare squarely where it belongs, on the shoulders of the parents. No effort is made to preserve that environment which until lately all civilized communities desired if they did not, in fact, enjoy it: an environment in which the family could attain its healthy fulfillment and meet its normal needs (of which the expenses

of child-bearing is clearly one) through the labors of the husband and the providence of the wife.

In the realms of popular culture there is further evidence of our betrayal. For there circulates amongst our people, and even amongst the youngest children, a vast quantity of literature, of popular songs, of films and news sheets and similar media of common culture, which is charged with an ideal of sexual or marital relationship directly opposed to Christian ideals of chastity and matrimony. Even when these things are not openly immoral, their tacit acceptance of the norms of free love is insidious and dangerous.

#### THREAT TO COMMUNITY

Our sins against the family may all be sins of omission, but the catalogue of evils that arise from them is no list of trifles. These evils do exist and it cannot be denied that singly and collectively they constitute a threat, not only to the well-being, but even to the existence of our community. Each of these evils bears directly either on the Sacrament of Matrimony, with its guardian virtue of chastity, or on the family as the first society. Their growth and our tolerance of them indicate an extraordinary and perplexing failure on the part of this staunchly Catholic people to cast its social institutions in the mould of its Christian ideals.

It is our indifference, our apathy

in the face of grave social evil that constitutes the most serious aspect of this problem of the family in Irish life. That such evils should arise is not in itself a serious matter. That such evils should arise and fail to produce any reaction is a serious matter, indeed. For it is in reaction that a people preserves its norms. But the decline of the families on the land has led to no popular outcry. No Government has been wrecked on the issue of rural decay. Against the evil of inordinate celibacy there can be no popular outburst, for this evil is rooted in the people's hearts. Housing is a source of discontent. But the powerful workers' organizations seem to have no better ideal of decent housing than that presented to them by a harassed municipality. One searches in vain for a glimmering of any ideal, any dream of a way that is better than this. One finds only this pathetic complacency. Whatever the Irish people is concerned about, and it is concerned about many things, it is not concerned about the family.

It is easy to fasten our eyes on the wholesome family life that does exist amongst us and to proclaim that this is proof that the nation is sound at heart. It is perhaps even easier to point to the inordinate celibacy of our men, or to the un-Christian character of our popular culture, and proclaim that this is rottenness to the core. But simplifications solve no problems. The truth is that a wide



gulf has opened between Christian ideals and Irish practice and this problem presents no easy solution.

It is not easy to understand how a nation remarkable for the fertility of its married women has allowed the most fruitful country in Europe to become miserably depopulated. It is not easy to understand how a nation which has carried patriotism to exalted and even exaggerated extremes can regard the progressive physical decay of its people with complacency and without dismay. It is very difficult to understand how a people so gloriously rich in vocations to the religious life can be so slow in answering the call to the privileges and dignities of Christian parenthood.

These are perplexing contradictions which make a mockery of any facile solution. Yet this much is certain. A nation's institutions are formed in the minds and hearts of the common people. The national life is made up of countless decisions made by insignificant individuals as day after weary day the pattern of their several lives is patiently traced out. These decisions, hesitant and conditioned though they may be, are nonetheless taken in the light of the ideals which the people cherish. If out of countless solutions to the same recurring problems, presented now to this one, now to that, there is built up a body of custom that is, at best, lacking the characteristic Christian note of generosity and, at worst,

warped by an unrelieved materialism, it can only be because the lives of the common people have been, in some measure, despoiled of the sweet breath of Christian inspiration. If the Irish people have failed to cherish the family with that tender solicitude which may rightly be expected of a Christian people, it can only be because their hearts are set on some ideal other than this.

#### SOCIAL IMPORTANCE

We no longer appreciate the great social importance of the family. We plan for prosperity; but we conceive a purely material prosperity which lacks some of the essential notes of human well-being. We think that a nation's prosperity can be represented by an import-export balance. We think that a worker's welfare can be measured by the contents of his pay packet. We ought to know that the only criterion of a nation's prosperity is the prosperity of her families. And we ought to know that the well-being of a family is not measured in units of currency, but in estimable degrees of material sufficiency and inestimable degrees of dignity and grace. When we learn to brood over the Irish family with the same jealous and passionate love with which we now brood over the Irish nation, we shall have found the true lodestone of our resurgence.

Many times in recent months, and with pathetic urgency, His Holiness



the Pope has called on Christian people everywhere to rally round the family, which is everywhere subject to a vicious attack. In Ireland we have been party to no attack on the family but we have made it the victim of a sad neglect. There is a great deal we must do if we are to match our enthusiasm for the family to the urgency of the Holy Father's call.

#### UNDERSTANDING OUR FAILURES

It is not enough to say that we have failed to safeguard the family. We must try to understand why we have so failed. It is not possible to prescribe a remedy until we have first diagnosed the disease. In a measure our failure is due to the fact that we are children of our time. To a far greater extent than many of us realize, we are involved in the great European-American civilization, which we may conveniently refer to as the West. We are even more intimately associated with that sphere of Western civilization which is organized around the great centers of London and New York. We are knit into this huge complexus by the most powerful ties of blood, of common language, of common economic interest. We share the political ideals of independence and liberty and the social ideals of material prosperity which characterize this bloc.

This Anglo-American world in which we live is still so characteristically Christian in its approach to

the major problems of life, as for instance in its concept of human dignity, its great respect for law and its love of civic order, that it provides us with a congenial environment for the development of our national life. Indeed, so largely do we depend on it for the maintenance of our national economy and for our high material prosperity that we must consider ourselves bound to this super-community by strong bonds of loyal piety.

But, unfortunately for itself and for us, on the precise points of marriage and the family the characteristic mind of this Western culture is diametrically opposed to Catholic teaching. Sex is cultivated as an end in itself. Marriage is viewed only as the culmination of romantic love. The social rights of the family are not recognized. Consequently there is no logic to oppose the demand for easy divorce. Children are regarded as a burden rather than a blessing. The dilemma of copulating without procreating is solved by frustrating the act of sex or by violating the foetal right to life. The natural function of parents as educators of their children is usurped by the State and an attempt is made to force a purely secular education on the children of all creeds. . .

In Ireland we cannot look at all this through a glass curtain. We are part and parcel of the Western bloc. If we think we embrace all its truths and reject all its errors, we only de-

lude ourselves. Indeed, we are very apt to delude ourselves when we speak of "alien influences which undermine our national morale." Such influences are no more alien in Ireland than they are in England or in Italy or in France. They are not so much alien as common. And, alien or common, they are part of the whole Western way of life, whose luxuries we so eagerly grasp. Immoral films and dollar aid, Sunday newspapers and Morris Minors, all come together in the same parcel. We must realize that many of the forces which make possible our comfortable way of living are the same forces which make difficult the development of a healthy family amongst us, while the cast of thought that makes the culture of the West so attractive to us is the same that makes the fulfillment of family life for us a matter of indifference.

It is necessary to evaluate carefully the influence which these characteristic Western ideas have on our attitude to marriage and the family. If we under-rate it, it may damage our national life grievously. If we over-estimate it, we may make of it a cloak for short-comings and backslidings which are peculiarly our own. It is probable that the indirect effects, such as those that arise from the pursuit of pleasure or from the attempt to attain to an excessively high standard of material prosperity, react more grievously on the family

than do open attacks on the marriage bond or on chastity.

It is hard for individuals to stand against the norms of the community. If, for instance, the norms are set, as they tend to be set throughout the Western world, by the standards which the childless couples or the parents of two children at most can attain, then the sacrifices demanded of the parents of large families will be made excessively great. In such ways as this a hard indifference to the best interests of the family may be built up. Individuals whose minds have been robbed of humility, and of that foolhardy generosity in making sacrifice of self which is the essence of the Christian spirit, surround themselves with narrow constricting conventions which blast the flowering of a wholesome family life.

#### ECONOMIC THINKING

In a measure, too, our people has been led astray by the modern habit of conceiving national prosperity in terms of economics. This mode of thinking may be logical enough for a Socialist state, and even in communities such as ours external trade balances, employment indices, indices of cost-of-living and all such cryptograms of accountancy have a certain value. But they can never serve as true criteria of national well-being. Not alone that, but if they are accepted as the goals of national endeavor, there is grave danger that

they may channel the nation's energy into an uninspired commercialism. Industrialism becomes an end in itself. Education is enslaved to commerce. The state accepts the dictates of the economists, and the nation, instead of fulfilling its destiny as a society, frustrates itself by becoming a factory.

But it must not be thought that all our difficulties spring from our participation in the civilization of the West. It may well be that the Western modes do no more than facilitate the emergence of an innate materialism and pride. Certainly no problem of the family is so perturbing, so stubbornly resistant of solution, as is the problem of celibacy and late-marrying amongst our farming community. Here there can be no question of so-called alien influence. This is a problem which, though it may be paralleled abroad, is peculiarly our own.

And it is a spiritual problem. Here the modes and customs of marriage have developed in such a way that no man marries unless he owns land, even though he may spend the whole of his days working the land. If a man of the farming class inherits land early in life, he marries early. If he inherits late, he marries late. If he does not inherit at all, he does not marry at all. In effect the number of families is equated to the number of holdings and whole classes of men are effectually denied their right

to marry and to establish families. When a purely material consideration is allowed to determine the lives, not of an individual here and there as will inevitably happen, but of a whole Catholic community, it is futile to talk of economic forces. No economic force could deny the men of Ireland their right to marry had they the will to exercise that right.

### GLORY OF PARENTHOOD

There is here a disregard for the duties and the privileges of parenthood which ill becomes Catholic men. Parenthood is the normal vocation of the laity. What effect such widespread celibacy has on individual lives is a matter for those who have the care of souls. But any man who loves his country is free to deplore the deprivation of flesh and blood which it entails. One can only hope and pray that a more generous spirit will move these people, that a more manly determination will stir them, before this old nation perishes through lack of numbers.

We are capable of better things than this. This Catholic people has the natural and supernatural gifts necessary to order a society in Christ. If there is greed and pride and lust and contention, there is also a wonderful faith and there is a widespread and generous spirit of self-sacrifice and dedication. What is lacking is a clearly conceived goal of national endeavor. The people needs

a concrete ideal on which to fasten its aspirations. The nationalism which sustained so many generations of our fathers has served its purpose. The dead shell of it is still cherished by some of the finest spirits amongst us for want of a living ideal. There is irony in this. For while we lacked the sovereignty we had the people. Now that we have the sovereignty our lack of the people bids fair to make a hollow mockery of it all. Perhaps it is a visitation for the sins committed in the name of the nation.

### SPIRIT OF THE NATION

We must fasten the eyes of the people on the family. The nation is nothing other than the nation's families. It is in the families that the spirit of the nation lives. The worker is only a myth. But the workingman's family is a vital unit of flesh and blood. National prosperity is the prosperity of the nation's families or it is nothing. If we make the true welfare of the nation's families the prime concern of our national effort, then the nation must prosper. For the cradle of the citizen is the mould of the state.

Statistics of stocks and crops can hide the fact that our fields are lonely of children. Indices of industrial production can blind us to the fact that our towns are growing out into ugly slums. To such arid graphs of national wealth we must oppose the living picture of true national pros-

perity: the picture of many families, young families, prosperous families; families independent and self-reliant; families housed in becoming environment; skillful families trained in the useful crafts. If we do not keep our eyes steadfastly on the nation's families, the powerful sweep of the economic stream will mould our life to the pattern of the materialistic centralized state. It is towards this that the whole economy of the Western super-state is directed. It recks nothing of the family but thinks only in terms of the individual and the state. It is geared to the production of material wealth alone. We aim at a more noble ideal, the perfection of society in consonance with human dignity.

There are notes in the gamut of human well-being which the modern philosophy of the West never sounds: notes of dignity, notes of humility, notes of wisdom and of peace. These are values which can never appear on any balance sheet. These are prizes denied to those who are fired with the fierce acquisitive spirit of our time. They are nonetheless essential to human happiness. If we fail to include these immaterial goods in the ideal of life by which we guide our social effort, they certainly will not come as a concomitant of material prosperity.

It has been the great illusion of our time to confuse wealth and well-being. Peace, not alone amongst

nations, but also in the heart of the humble man, harmony between citizens, leisure to contemplate the beauties of creation and of truth, freedom to practise the creative arts, in the exercise of which man most closely mirrors his Creator: these are social goods which will not be attained unless they are deliberately sought after. These are the ends which material prosperity subserves. These are the only worthwhile goals of social endeavor.

### TWO PROBLEMS

It is clear that those who wish to cast the manners and customs of our public life in a truly Christian mould must face two distinct problems: one, our divergence from the accepted norms of the Western world on the issue of marriage and the family in society; the other, our own incomprehensible indifference to the family as the basic social unit and to parenthood as a noble lay vocation.

The second is the problem we must tackle first. So long as our people is content to make an uneasy alliance with Mammon, the first will cause them no disquiet. As soon, however, as we begin to organize our society around the family and to strive for the fullest possible development of family life amongst us, we shall come face to face with organizational problems which may afford no easy solution. We may be called on to sacrifice some measure of material pros-

perity for the sake of our Christian way of life. For the Christian life necessarily challenges the materialism of the West and the West will not be patient of our particular difficulties. We may find it hard to integrate our economy based on a full family life with the economy of the larger unit, which will certainly be based on the centralized state. However, there is no need to take the gloomiest view. As we have said, we are part of the West and as such we are as well fitted to influence it as it is to influence us. We shall at least have the advantage of a sound political philosophy.

And if our people will not marry, let us remember that they are a Catholic people and preach to them the Vocation of Matrimony. It is fitting that the laity, as well as the clergy, should dedicate their lives to the service of Christ. Marriage is a sacrament which exalts the humble routines of daily life to the realms of grace and affords the laity an ideal means of personal sanctification.

Nor should the importance of the Irish family to the Universal Church be minimized. For generations humble Irish emigrants have been carrying the Faith through the length and breadth of the English-speaking world; and in the religious orders the sons and daughters of our race have reaped a glorious harvest in the mission fields. This great work for Christ is rooted deeply in Ireland's

Catholic homes. It is the flower of a noble tradition of family life which, at best, we are failing to cherish; which, at worst, we are permitting to decay. One does not presume to understand the Divine intention in these things; but it may well be that the Irish laity is neglecting a vocation far more glorious than we dream.

### A GREAT PERSPECTIVE

The pity is that we have lost the courage for audacious planning. Our picture of the future envisages only the present miserable remnant of a nation. But think what six or eight or even ten millions of Irish folk might do. Who can imagine that such a teeming Irish population would not overflow in another great and continuing exodus of Christians to lands that are thirsty for Grace.

There is need here of a great work of propaganda. For it is necessary to teach, or say rather to remind, our people of a better way of regarding things. Every custom, every convention, every accepted norm of behavior, every privilege and prejudice, every project and plan is to be questioned, tested, re-examined in the light of true standards. Does this hinder the family? Does it help the family? And we must proceed to the development of new institutions. From whom shall we learn? Much good work has been done abroad by nations which have been wiser in these things than we. We may profit

from their experience. But in the main we shall have to fashion the instruments of our new development out of our own needs. If we can fire our people with the determination to develop family life to its fullest in the teeth of any obstacle, they themselves will fashion out of their own lives the institutions proper to a Christian people.

Our society as it is today is little better than an off-shoot of the great materialist powers of the West. They are designed to produce the greatest possible quantity of material goods in the foolish belief that human well-being is synonymous with wealth. Because we have not found in our Christianity a creative force to oppose the materialistic dynamism of the West, it is moulding our society to its own pattern. It is drawing our people from the land and herding them into cities or into towns. It is forcing on us its norm of the small family. It is opposing its cult of sex and pleasure to our ideal of chastity and love. It is providing us with a wealth of material goods; but it is thwarting and frustrating the development of a wholesome and dignified family life amongst us.

The fault is our own. We are bound by no shackles other than our pride and our greed. The family is the foundation of our state. If we live in the light of that truth, we shall prosper. If we forget it, our history is at its end.

# Indecent Literature and the Law

VINCENT C. ALLRED

*Reprinted from CATHOLIC ACTION\**

OF LATE there has been a national awakening to the menace of indecent literature. The boldness of publishers in this field has made our newsstand displays so disgusting that the public can no longer be indifferent. Likewise, there has come a realization that indecent literature is tied in not only with juvenile delinquency, but with moral decay in adults as well. There has been agitation for corrective action in both Congress and State legislatures. The most widely publicized manifestation has been the investigation by a Select Committee of the House of Representatives, the "Gathings Committee." Its report, recently published as House Report No. 2510, is probably the most comprehensive survey of the problem yet made. It is probable that this movement is motivated more from social considerations than basic moral principle; yet its objectives are consistent with the natural law and the Church's teachings. It behooves Catholic Actionists to do all they can to forward worthwhile endeavors in this direction. Herein is attempted a brief survey of legal questions involved.

First of all, there is no lack of statutes already on the books. Only one State, New Mexico, has no statute prohibiting or at least discouraging indecent literature.

"Although the specific language used is different in almost all the various State and territorial statutes on this subject, nevertheless, they all universally condemn the 'writing, composition printing, publishing, sale, distribution, keeping for sale, loan or exhibition of any obscene writing, paper, book, picture, print,' etc. (Report of Select Committee, page 33.)

There is a Federal statute declaring unmailable, and prohibiting the mailing of "every obscene, lewd, lascivious or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, paper, letter, writing, print, or other publication of an indecent character." (Section 1461, Title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, U.S. Code.)

Another Federal statute prohibits the bringing into the United States, or the transportation in interstate commerce by common carrier, of such matters. (Section 1462.)

State statutes make unlawful the actual display, sale or giving away of

\* 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Wash. 5, D. C., April, 1953.



such matters, and in most communities are supplemented by municipal ordinances of like import.

### WHAT ABOUT OBSCENITY?

One question immediately occurring to the Catholic Actionist is the reconciliation of moral and legal standards as to what constitutes obscenity. On the moral side, Rev. James McVann, C.S.P., St. Paul's College, Washington, D. C., in a question and answer discussion of the broader subject of pornography entitled "Smut for Sale," has said:

"Should a distinction be made about pornography?

"Not in kind but in degree. What may be called first-degree pornography includes enticing pictures of the nude or almost nude and directly suggestive copy or recordings. They offer a temptation against the modesty of most people.

"Second-degree, or relative, pornography includes pictures, copy or records which, while they may not offend against the modesty of many, will be a serious temptation to some, and particularly to adolescents."

Existing obscenity statutes, as a rule, do not go much into detail. Usually, as with the Federal statutes, they use terms such as "obscene," "impure," "indecent," "filthy," "lascivious," and so on. It is for the Court to say whether a particular piece of printed or pictured matter falls within the prohibition.

In construing the term "obscene," a Federal court spoke as follows:

"... the meaning of the word 'obscene' as legally defined by the courts is: tending to stir the sex impulses or to lead to sexually impure and lustful thoughts . . . whether a particular book would tend to excite such impulses and thoughts must be tested by the court's opinion as to its effect on a person with average sex instincts. . . . (*One Book "Ulysses,"* 5 F. Supp. 182.)

The above would appear to limit the prohibition to what Father McVann calls "first-degree pornography." This rule has been called the "Federal" or "modern" rule. There had been an earlier rule taken from an English case to the effect that:

"The test of obscenity is this, whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscene is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall." (*Regina v. Hicklin*, 3 Queens Bench 360, 1868.)

The "Federal" rule is applied in most Federal Courts, although the Supreme Court has not passed on the question. "Although a good many State courts have accepted the 'modern' . . . rule . . . the majority still retain the 'common law' or '*Regina v. Hicklin*' rule." (Report of Select Committee, p. 33.)

Extended comparison of these two "rules" is probably unprofitable, but



it will be noted that it is sufficient under the "common law rule" if the matter in question has a "tendency" to "deprave and corrupt." It would seem, then, that under this "common law rule" there would be a greater opportunity to extend the statutory prohibition to matters within Father McVann's "second-degree" classification.

In a few States the statute goes beyond merely prescribing legal test words for obscenity. In Massachusetts, for instance, there is a further prohibition on matters "manifestly tending to corrupt the morals of youth." This provision was upheld by the Supreme Judicial Court of the State in the case of *Commonwealth v. Isestadt*, 62 NE 2d 840, (1945).

The Massachusetts statute, likewise, provides a more severe penalty when the indecent matter is placed in the hands of persons under the age of eighteen.

New York and twenty other States prohibit the sale of "any book, pamphlet, magazine, newspaper or other printed paper devoted to the publication and principally made up of criminal news, police reports, or accounts of criminal deeds, or pictures, or stories of deeds of bloodshed, lust or crime. . . ."

In the case of *Winter v. People of the State of New York*, 333 U.S. 507, 68 S. Ct. 665, the Supreme Court of the United States held this statute unconstitutional on the ground its

language was too vague—"Men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning." This decision is itself uncertain as to its scope because it was in part based on a construction of the statute written into it by the New York Court of Appeals which had held it applicable where accounts of crime and bloodshed were "so massed as to become vehicles for inciting violent and depraved crimes." It was to this last that especial exception was taken. The effect of the *Winter* decision has been to render uncertain the validity of such statutes, although there has been no further adjudication.

Most obscenity statutes are strictly criminal statutes, that is, they provide only for punishment after an offense is committed. A few States, for instance Nebraska and Montana, have incorporated a preventive element by providing for court orders directing the destruction or impounding of offensive matter.

#### FEDERAL STATUTES

The Federal statutes are geared to this preventive principle in that in addition to their punitive provisions, they forbid the use of the mails to such matters, and deny them entrance into the country or carriage by common carrier in interstate commerce. It is the practice of the Post Office Department to "order returned to the sender all mail addressed to any person or concern obtaining or attempt-

ing to obtain remittance of money through the mail for any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile article, matter, thing, . . ." (Report of Select Committee, p. 117.)

It might be noted here that the prohibition of Section 1462 is only against carriage in interstate commerce *by common carrier*, that is, by railroads, trucking lines, air lines, etc. If otherwise transported there is no statutory prohibition.

In its conclusions the Select Committee said: "Generally, with certain exceptions . . . legislation, both Federal and State, is sufficient, insofar as it can be in view of the difficulty of establishing, legislatively, a test whereby 'obscenity' can be determined." (p. 35.)

#### IMPROVING STATE STATUTES

The Catholic Actionist can probably agree in substance. However, we think State statutes could be improved by amendment, so as to include:

1. A preventive feature such as found in Nebraska and Montana;
2. Additional punishment where sale or donation is to minors;
3. Extension of the statutory prohibition so as to specifically include matters less than "first-degree pornography." In this connection some clarification of the *Winter* decision would be helpful, or statutory language should be employed sufficiently definite to avoid its objections.

While primarily a judicial, rather than a legislative problem, substitution of the "common law rule" for the "Federal" would be of great assistance in enforcement.

The existing loophole in Section 1462 could be plugged by making any carriage of obscene matter across State lines or in interstate commerce an offense, regardless of the agency employed. The Senate recently passed and sent to the House S 10 which would have this effect. In the House there is pending HR 569 which would increase the Postmaster General's powers in impounding indecent mail.

From the above it would appear that, while some statutory amendment would be in order, existing statutes are adequate in the main, even if not ideal, except for New Mexico where there is no such statute. Why, then, the horrible appearance of our newsstands? Although somewhat beyond the scope of this article, which has been devoted to the legal aspects, it might be said briefly, by way of conclusion, that the principal reason probably lies in lack of effective public demand for enforcement of the statutes we do have. As long as good citizens, including Catholic Actionists, are indifferent to their drug store newsracks, very little will be done about them. At the same time, isolated protests from individuals may be ignored when public officials are themselves indifferent, or feel politically indebted to news vendor groups. Only

by community organization can effective relief be obtained. In some instances community organization has already obtained satisfying, substantial results.

This then seems to be the answer:

Some amendment of State and Federal statutes will help, but if a real clean-up is to be had, it must come through organized public demand for vigorous enforcement of the laws in effect.



### ***Business of Life***

We need serious thought, with resultant resolution, about the work of winning our way to heaven. God has put us here to do just that, and not a thing else. That is the only reason we have for occupying space, for breathing the air. Now, it is one thing to realize the factual character of this truth; it is quite another to put the truth into practical realization by living daily in its light. "Academic assent" is not enough; practical recognition is required. Truth makes men free to travel the true path; truth is the light that makes the path plain. But we have to *use freedom and walk in the path*. It is a long walk, and a fatiguing walk; for we carry the Cross of Christ as we go. It is the only way to success; and when we get into it with energy, we find that the labor it exacts brings peace and joy.—CATHOLIC TIMES, *Columbus, Ohio*, Mar. 6, 1953.



### ***Criticism Begins at Home***

We live in times not unlike those of the Apostle. These are days which call for the basic kind of thinking that Paul did, the unqualified clarity as well as the charity with which the Apostle put first things first and named things by their proper names, never seeking a fight for a fight's own sake, but certainly never backing away from one for the unworthy sake of his own comfort, particularly when the interests of Christ or His Church are at issue.

Sometimes the need for speaking up requires that we rebuke our own when by their actions they do disservice to Christ and His Church. This we must always be prompt and firm to do. It is only fit that Catholic Christians should at all times be their own sternest critics, and certainly we have the obligation to put our house in order before we find fault with the procedures of others.—*Archbishop Cushing in an Easter Sunday sermon, April 13, 1952.*

# The Catholic Layman in Labor-Management Relations

QUENTIN OGREN

*Reprinted from Labor-Management PANEL\**

**T**HE job of the Catholic layman in labor-management relations is to restore all things in this relationship to Christ.

To restore all things to Christ is certainly not the job anybody hires the Catholic layman to do. Unions don't generally select business agents for their demonstrated ability to exemplify the life of Christ in their dealings. Corporations can hardly be said to select their industrial relations or personnel men on this basis either.

It is inevitable that the Catholic layman, like everybody else, should get the idea that, if he hires his services out to somebody else, his job is simply to deliver the best deal he can get for his principal. Religious considerations are something to talk about but have little practical relevance to his daily work. The labor relations field is a highly technical one. Those who do the hiring look for somebody with the requisite "know-how," a technician, a specialist who can solve problems in a complex field.

Most of the men who act in this field are, therefore, not principals but agents or representatives. Consequently, there is a diffusion of responsibility, particularly in large organizations, both in labor and in management. Each man is apt to say: "I am not responsible for this move. Whether the moral content is good or bad—I am merely an instrument." And so the feeling grows that I am not responsible, and therefore I may do things as a mere agent or representative which I would not do if I were acting for myself. This widespread moral buck-passing violates the principles that each man is morally responsible for his own acts, and that a man may not do in the name of another what he is forbidden to do in his own name.

Most men who come to labor-management relations as a career are motivated at the outset by considerations of justice. Too often they become so engrossed in the means as to lose sight of the end they had in mind when they started their work. And the means they are usually taught, with some exceptions, are means of struggle and deception.

\* University of San Francisco, San Francisco 17, Calif., March, 1953.

When a union seeks to organize employees, it ordinarily maps a campaign which is built on the premise of employer resistance. As one union man put it, "You can't expect them to join if you tell them: 'The boss is a swell guy, and therefore you need a union.'" The customary employer reaction is to fight the union, largely out of fear and partly out of determination to run his own business.

When the union finally becomes successful and collective bargaining begins, the means of deception are a frequent practice. Each party tries to give the other side a false impression of its strength. When the parties become practised in this game, they are often successful in making a temporary peace which reflects the power relationships that exist between them. Considerations of survival ordinarily dictate a settlement which permits the parties to live together in a condition which Professor Sumner Slichter has described as "a state of antagonistic cooperation." Ordinarily, the emphasis is on the antagonism and not the cooperation.

If a Catholic layman is to succeed in this field, he will probably play the game the way everybody else plays it. If the Catholic layman, however, regards himself as a Catholic who happens to be working in labor relations, and not merely as a labor relations man who happens to be a Catholic, he will find means to bring Our Lord's justice and charity to a field in which injustice and bitterness are displayed almost daily.

Here the Catholic layman can do something unique. He can go about seeking justice in a charitable way. There are a few on both sides who are sophisticated enough to know that justice has to start somewhere, and so it might as well start with them. They are good enough technicians to couch their honest proposals in conservative terms. They are straight-forward enough to build team-work where there was hostility and to reduce the natural antagonisms which are inherent in this field.

#### A CHRISTIAN BUSINESS AGENT

A union leader friend of mine called a strike one day on fifteen construction jobs which were being run simultaneously in different parts of the city by one contractor. The issue in the strike was wages.

After the strike started, the union learned that five of the fifteen jobs involved forty-five per-cent penalties for the contractor if he failed to complete them on time. The union leader said to the contractor: "We know five of these fifteen jobs are penalty jobs, but we don't know which ones they are. We want you to tell us." The contractor answered: "It's none of your business." The union leader replied: "All right, I'll tell you why we

want to know. If the strike continues on those five penalty jobs, you will go broke. And if so, you can't pay the wages we're asking on the other jobs. If we know what the five penalty jobs are, we will call off the strike on those five. Then we'll talk with you about the other ten." The contractor said: "You're either awfully stupid or awfully smart. I can't decide which." The union man said: "Let's say I'm neither very stupid nor very smart, but that I am just trying to be very fair." The contractor replied: "I won't say that because I don't believe it." Before the union leader left the contractor's office, however, the contractor identified the five penalty jobs. The union leader picked up the telephone and called off the strike on those jobs. They reached agreement on the wage issue for the other ten jobs. The entire strike was ended before the union leader left the contractor's office.

#### A CHRISTIAN BUSINESSMAN

The second story has to do with a management negotiator for a national steel fabricating corporation. This corporation purchased a plant where the labor policy of the predecessor company had been not only tough but unjust. The union leadership was Communistic—that was the only kind of leadership that was a match for the old management.

The company's industrial relations director received the union's typical blue-sky demands, not only on wages, but on almost everything else. When the negotiations started, he laid all his papers on the table where everybody could see them. He said to the union's committee: "You have demanded thirty cents an hour, which you don't expect to get. We could come back with two cents an hour, which we would not expect you to accept, and we could sit here for weeks haggling about the difference. I have gone over the whole thing and drawn up a contract which seems to be fair and just to both of us. On wages, it goes to twelve and a half cents per hour. This is not a counterproposal. I am dealing this way with you because we expect to be in business here for a long time, and we ought to be operating on a basis of mutual trust. You could come back and say: 'That's not enough. We want still more.' If you do, maybe you can make us give more this time. We don't think you will do that because we think you want to have us deal forthrightly with you all the time. We think you will want to encourage us to deal that way in the future."

The union leader was caught off-base by this approach. None of his usual talents was very useful in this situation. He asked a number of questions, and when he was finally convinced of management's sincerity, he requested adjournment. Two hours later the contract was signed.

Notice that men who act as the union leader and the industrial relations director acted have a Christian philosophy which governs their work. They do not accentuate the conflict between the classes. They bring the classes together and bridge the gaps between them. They act on Christian principles themselves and, by so acting, they educate the others.

Notice that they are resolute men. They are neither weak nor confused. They make an effective and manly contribution to the common good. To do that, their actions have to be motivated by Christ-like regard for the other side of the collective bargaining table.

The Church has the answer to the problems in this field—not in detail, but in principle. Many who work in this field, Catholics and non-Catholics, welcome practical Christian answers. The men who can furnish practical Christian answers are Catholic laymen who know their jobs—and who deliberately and in a charitable way undertake to restore all things to Christ.



### ***Secular Heroism and Sanctity***

The kind of heroism demanded by Christianity is universal (attainable by every man) and contemporary (common to every age). Secular heroism is not divine election but human adulation, and thus marked for a special few and marked by a shifting of standards. St. Paul is a contemporary and universal figure, whereas yesterday's secular hero is tomorrow's stumble-bum.

If we confuse Christian heroism with secular heroism, we endow sainthood with certain romantic, exotic and bizarre features as an excuse for feeling no urge to let its appeal disrupt the bourgeois tenor of our own affairs. Yet the heroics of sanctity deal with commonplace things. Christ, Our Hero and Our Lord (leader), exemplified heroism in regard to commonplace matters. He knew indigence, ingratitude, suffering and death. These, though somewhat less in intensity, are the common lot of every man. Sainthood heroics are seldom a matter of going into the ring with Joe Louis, standing before a firing squad, hitting a home run at the Polo Grounds, carrying a serum into the infected wilds of Tibet. Usually sanctity deals with child-bearing, earning an honest living, suffering pain, bearing ingratitude—all of them as common to one side of the globe as to the other.—*Ed. Willock in INTEGRITY, New York, N. Y., November, 1952.*



# U.S. Immigration Policy

MOST REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING  
*Archbishop of Boston*

*Address to the Immigration Institute of Boston College, February 6, 1953*

**A** DEBATE about immigration policy is on again. As in all the other debates on this subject—and we have had them since the first session of Congress—the sides are sharply divided and the ammunition varied. But this time the debate is taking place at a stage in world affairs the like of which has never before confronted the nation.

To understand the vigor and magnitude of this debate we must first understand the immediate causes for it. In the first place, the entire world is in the throes of a crisis, perhaps the most critical ever to confront our civilization. It is essentially an ideological struggle in which the forces of darkness and tyranny are pitted against the forces of freedom, free institutions and human dignity. So intense is this struggle that thinking men more and more are becoming convinced that one side or the other must win, and victory for one means obliteration for the other. The outcome of this conflict could very well determine the course of history and the type of world man must live in for centuries to come.

This conflict has created problems which test the very foundation of our civilization. These are problems which we and all other freedom-loving people must face up to squarely and resolutely. Our failure to do so can bring nothing but disaster to everything we hold dear in life.

The greatest problems growing out of this struggle are the human problems. This is so because the greatest strength and treasure of our cause is found in the dignity and worth of the individual. Just the opposite is true of our adversary. As a consequence it behooves us to take a careful look at the condition of our human resources.

## ESCAPEES

As we look to Europe we find two very disturbing problems. The first is that caused by the thousands of persecuted people who have escaped the oppression of Communism to find asylum in the free world. They come from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and Soviet Russia. We call them escapees—escapees from Communism—with all that

it signifies. They find asylum for the most part in West Germany, West Austria, Italy, Greece and Turkey. Their lot is a desperate one. All they seek is the opportunity to join the forces of freemen where they can work and live in dignity.

### OVERPOPULATION

The second problem stems from overpopulation, and its victims are those who do not play a useful role in or share the benefits of the civilization of which they are a part. They do not share because the economy and natural resources of their country do not now and cannot in the foreseeable future use their labor, skills and talents. These tremendous human resources must not be wasted or permitted to lie idle. They are the special target of the Red conspirators, who ruthlessly exploit every weakness in the social structure of the free world. The countries handicapped by overpopulation are Italy, Greece, the Netherlands and Western Germany. We must remind ourselves that all of these countries must stand as bastions of the free world, all are or will soon be members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. They are our full partners in the struggle to preserve our way of life. We cannot help but admire them when, faced with overpopulation at home, they keep open their doors of asylum to those who are suffering the fate of martyrs in the East.

Our allies cannot solve these two large human problems alone. They need our help and good example. The question is, how do we give the most effective help? In March, 1952 President Truman, in a special message to the Congress, called attention to these two problems and made it clear that finding a solution to them was of the highest urgency. He first of all pointed out that this was a task for the free world itself and that American leadership was necessary, just as it was in getting the problem of displaced persons resolved. To that end he proposed that there be admitted into the United States a total of 300,000 immigrants over a three-year period, to be selected from among the escapees from Communism and the victims of overpopulation. The same safeguards as applied in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as to security, housing, employment, etc., were to be essential parts of this plan. It was left to Congress to determine what form this action should take. Congress could enact temporary emergency legislation wherein the immigrants would be nonquota or it could adjust the basic immigration law to provide for the pooling of unused quotas authorized under the national origins formula.

To carry out the President's recommendations, model bills were introduced in Congress. Public hearings on the problem were held by the Judiciary Committee of the House.

However, no action was taken by the Congress before adjournment and there the issue rests.

It is important to note here that once again we are held powerless, by law, to do our part and thus give positive leadership to the free world in its efforts to increase its internal strength.

#### MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT

Meanwhile, on the day before Christmas, a new immigration law which claimed to codify and simplify 154 years of immigration legislation went into effect. Passed over President Truman's veto, its 302 pages have kept immigration officials busy and occasioned universal debate. Mr. Truman condemned it. President Eisenhower said that it must be rewritten. A Presidential Commission opened hearings on the legislation in eleven American cities.

On New Year's Day this Commission released its report. It concluded that the new Immigration Act "should be reconsidered and revised from beginning to end." The reasons for this conclusion were that the immigration and nationality law embodies policies and principles that are unwise and injurious to the nation. It rests upon an attitude of hostility and distrust toward all aliens. It applies discriminations against human beings on account of national origin, race, creed and color. It ignores the needs of the United States in domestic affairs and

foreign policies. It contains unnecessary and unreasonable restrictions and penalties against individuals. It is badly drafted, confusing and in some respects unworkable.

On the other side of the debate it was claimed among other things that more than a hundred organizations had endorsed the new legislation.

The United States should establish an immigration policy which is in harmony with its own needs and its recognized leadership among free and democratic nations. Such a policy should be positive. It should seek rather than deter immigrants—within the limit of these needs and inspired by its leadership.

The new immigration policy should involve the fullest participation of all voluntary groups. Their services can be used to supplement those of the Federal Government in the selection of immigrants and in their actual resettlement and integration in the United States. Experience shows that voluntary organizations, especially those of religious denomination, made a great contribution to the resettlement of displaced persons. A continuing interest in immigration policies permeates all their welfare programs. The social aspects of the foreign policy of the United States, particularly in the form of international relief and of technical aid for undeveloped areas, are of predominant interest in these agencies. But they have come to recognize, unani-

mously, that immigration should be a fundamental part of our foreign policy program.

One of the great difficulties about immigration during the past thirty years has been the lack of broad citizen interest. This is reflected in a similar lack of interest on the part of the members of our Congress. The fullest participation of voluntary organizations in the field of immigration legislation is the best assurance of securing continued citizen interest.

In order to obtain their objectives in immigration legislation and policy, the voluntary organizations must sponsor and stimulate a continuing educational program among all groups in the United States. This calls for the constant review and evaluation of legislation and policies. It means the broadening of interest on the part of all the citizens who make up our great country in dealings with the peoples of other countries. A permanent campaign against racial and national prejudice is necessary. A better appreciation on the part of all citizens of the leadership of America in the world of today must be achieved. In fine, what is needed is an educational program, which is really charity in action, in a field where it has been woefully absent.

Voluntary organizations in the United States which are interested in immigration legislation and policy must work hand in hand with the educational institutions, large and

small, of our country. Fortunately, the testimony given by the representatives of important universities before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization offers a new hope for a more lenient and Christian policy in American immigration legislation. There is also concrete evidence that the interest of the universities in this subject is growing steadily. This, in time, will bring a new literature in the field, which is bound eventually to reach educational institutions of many other countries. The institutes or workshops to be offered by several universities during this coming year are an evidence of the broad interest in this program and their efforts to bring new knowledge—a new point of view—on immigration to the citizens in general. It is encouraging to know that more and more of these workshops will be developed by the universities as time goes on.

#### ENLIGHTENED PROGRAM NEEDED

It is to be hoped, moreover, that civic and religious groups will make the enlightenment of their people on immigration legislation and policy an integral part of their program for this year. We trust that these groups will accept the report of the President's Commission, including the two volumes of the hearings before the Commission, as the basis of an extensive pamphlet literature of their own.

A new program of education in re-

gard to immigration legislation and policy will inevitably have a far-reaching influence on the whole foreign policy of the United States. It is bound to make the citizens of every country more and more sensitive to the attitudes of people of other countries of the world. It should make us equally sensitive to the rising tide of opposition to any kind of racial or national discrimination throughout the world. Other peoples throughout the world are very sensitive to what goes on in the United States at the present time. We must be equally sensitive to what goes on abroad.

It has been emphasized over and over again by many American leaders that our immigration legislation is accepted throughout the world as a fair measure of our attitude toward other peoples. If these people do not feel that we respect them, that we have an understanding of their point of view—then we cannot expect them to be friendly towards us. Our enemies will use this as another weapon for alienating other people, and the free world in general, from us. This is a thought that cannot fail to impress any American who travels abroad ex-

tensively. The traveler is especially conscious of the sensibilities of other peoples on this subject.

There is hardly another American policy that has been more generally discussed recently in foreign lands than that of immigration legislation. When the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act was passed, there was extensive newspaper comment in almost every country. Again, there was general publicity when the act went into effect last month. Finally, there was a new wave of interest abroad following the release of the report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. This report offered a new hope throughout the world of the possibility of a more generous attitude towards immigration on the part of the American people. If we carry out an extensive educational program and make the conclusions of this commission better known, it will take us a long way towards developing an immigration policy that is in harmony with the needs and responsibilities of the United States in our present-day world. To that end we are sponsoring this immigration institute.



We must serve God in men to bring them to God. We must love men because God loves them and is in them, preserving them for Himself. The poor are the treasure of the Church; they are loved in a special way by God; therefore we must be especially assiduous in serving them, in showing love for them.—*John Stanley in INTEGRITY, March, 1953.*

## Editorials

### **Politics Needs Morality**

**S**HOULD they wish a code of conduct for their political life, and an ideal for their personal life, men in public office need only write upon their hearts these penetrating words of Pope Pius XI:

Today more than ever the acute world crises demand that those who dispose of immense funds, built up on the sweat and toil of millions, keep constantly and singly in mind the common good. State functionaries and all employees are obliged in conscience to perform their duties faithfully and unselfishly, imitating the brilliant example of distinguished men of the past and of our own day who with unremitting labor sacrificed their all for the good of the country (Encyclical: *Divini Redemptoris*).

Political life in New Jersey cries out for just such men who will "keep constantly and singly in mind the common good." We have known all too frequently the evil which men in political life can do when they neglect their obligation in conscience to discharge their duties faithfully and unselfishly. The sacrifice of one's all for the good of one's country is freely asked of the youth of today in the service of the colors; but their elders in political life who ask this of them too seldom practise what they preach.

To the good citizen who is deeply concerned at the almost constant charges and counter-charges of political corruption headlined in turn in different counties of our State, the reminder may be in order that the citizen gets the politicians he deserves. Corruption in politics will not survive an aroused citizenry, even as it would not be alive save through the failure of the good to guard against it.

Two steps are imperative now that corruption seems to be so frequent an evil amongst us, both imposed by the Fourth Commandment, which requires of citizens a sincere interest in the country's political welfare and an active part in works of good citizenship.

First is the duty to uncover and wipe out corruption in whatever political territory, in whatever political party, in whatever political office it may now be. Each voting citizen must hold men in elective offices strictly to account, for their own good conduct and that of all those whom they place upon the rolls of public service. Corrupted and corrupting office holders, in high or low station, who refuse to regard themselves as servants of the common good must be discharged, with due regard, of

course, for their civic rights. The elected official who will not discharge them, or who will not sufficiently protect us from the entrance of these men into power, must be turned out of office as soon as voting laws permit. A good citizen's ballot is his sword against evil. It is also his reward for the good officials of the community.

Next comes the duty of filling the shoes of the unfit with men and women of political integrity and stature. To some extent such men and women are already in public life, oftentimes in less publicized positions. Let them now come forward as good citizens to seek positions of greater authority and influence. If this means sacrifice of convenience, if it entails expense or the strain of pressure, let them consider whether our men in Korea have a right to ask this of them.

Most of all perhaps we must raise up a generation of younger men and women in whom the ideals of public service will burn brilliantly. In the youth of the day, so many of them ideally suited for the tasks of public service, lies our only hope of permanent relief from the disgrace of civic corruption. To all who are courageous our country holds out an invitation to political service, a life perhaps underpaid, often difficult, but as vitally needed as careers in medicine or law or military life.

We wonder if Catholics who have

had the advantage of a Catholic college education are sufficiently aware of the opportunity and of the duty of political service. — ADVOCATE, Newark, N. J., March 28, 1953.

### *Man Is Important*

**T**O YOUR doctor you may be just another grouchy patient; to your neighbor, just the next-door pest; to your closest friends, even to your own family, you may be an insufferable bore. But to one person—or rather to three Persons—you are mighty important. Holy Week is a reminder that God thought you important enough to become man to save you.

God alone knows you as you are. He knows the best side of you and the worst side of you. He knows the secret thoughts and memories you would never reveal to a living soul. And still He loves you. That's the surprising thing.

God knows your sins. All of them: how nasty you can be, how selfish, how cold to the sufferings of others, how full of prejudice, how hypocritical a Christian. And still God considers you important. That is the startling lesson of Holy Week. And it is a lesson that has a special significance today.

In what we call the free world men are not so sure as they used to be that the individual human being is important. The more our modern scientists, sociologists and psychologists study



man, the more pessimistic many of them become. They are discouraged with man as they find him; they would make him over to fit into a dream-world where there will be no poverty, no war. They no longer believe in the importance of man; they believe rather in the importance of some future superman who will be the product of a new society to which individual men must now be sacrificed. Like the Communists, whom they profess to abhor, these scientists would eventually enslave men, for they value them not for what they are in themselves but only for what they can contribute to society.

Whatever we consider worthwhile in our free world sprang from the unique idea that an individual human being is something sacred, having rights of his own, having a worth in himself apart from what he can do for his fellow men or the state. Before the coming of Christ no one suspected that a human being was worth something merely because he was a human being. The ancient pagans (and the modern ones, too, for that matter) valued men as we now might value a horse: so long as they were useful as soldiers or ditch diggers they had a worth; once they lost their usefulness they lost their worth.

It was the God who became man who demonstrated that all men, however wretched or seemingly useless, are important as individuals.

"You have been bought at a great

price," St. Paul says. That is the reason for believing that we are important as individuals. That is the only ultimate reason for believing we are free.—INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD, Indianapolis, Ind., March 27, 1953.

### Modern Gnostics

ON ITS thirtieth birthday *Time* Magazine fashioned some planks for its editorial platform and in so doing may have enriched our vocabulary by resurrecting an almost forgotten word.

The word is "Gnostic." Up until now it has been mainly current in Church History classes.

The original Gnostics were heretics who plagued the Catholic Church 1800 years ago, about 100 years after the death of Christ. Their name comes from the Greek word, gnosis, meaning knowledge. Intellectual snobs, they thought that they were superior to ordinary Christians because they had access to some sort of secret knowledge.

The Gnostic teaching, examined at this late date, is seen to be nonsensical gibberish. Philip Hughes in his history of the Catholic Church describes it as something "where sounds abound and sense is far to seek."

These old-time Gnostics have disappeared. But *Time*, inspired by a recent book, *The New Science of Politics*, by Eric Voegelin of Louisiana

State University, thinks that there are too many Gnostics among the intellectuals of the world today.

These present-day Gnostics are described as men having an erroneous conception of human nature. Denying original sin and disbelieving in man's fallen nature, they think that heaven can be realized here on earth.

The twentieth-century Gnostics, like their namesakes of the second century, are great windbags. Instead of dealing realistically and laboriously with social problems, they chant slogans and catch-words: "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," "Economic Democracy," "One World or None."

Writes Eric Voegelin:

Gnostic societies and their leaders will recognize dangers to their existence when they develop, but such dangers will not be met by appropriate action in the world of reality. They will rather be met by magic operations in the dream world, such as disapproval, moral condemnation, declarations of intention, resolutions, appeals to the conscience of mankind, branding of enemies as aggressors, outlawing of war, propaganda for world peace and world government, etc. . . .

This is a fair picture of many of our intellectual leaders and statesmen—our contemporary Gnostics.

*Time* Magazine, in opposition to the Gnostics, states what it calls its convictions. Here are some of them for the reader's inspiration:

"That God's order in man's world includes a moral code, based upon man's unchanging nature and not

subject to man's repeal, suspension or amendment."

"That, as Supreme Court Justice Douglas said, 'we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being' and that American history cannot be understood or correct policy formed without understanding of that fact."

"That all attempts, revolutionary or reformist, of progress based on the idea that man is perfectible will lead to stagnation at best and calamity at worst."

These "convictions" may seem to be statements of the obvious to Catholics and to all reflective Christians. They are not held, however, by some of the most influential American intellectuals—especially the statement that morality is unchangeable and imposed by God. They are rejected by an alarmingly large number of professors who mould the minds of the young in university class rooms and write our text-books.

American intellectual life is in a bad way when a magazine of general circulation must state such principles explicitly rather than take them for granted. We predict that *Time* will get a large number of letters calling it obscurantist and reactionary.

*Time* has enunciated some sound principles of journalism and of life. We hope that in its practice it will have the courage of its convictions.—THE WITNESS, Dubuque, Iowa, March 19, 1953.

## Documentation

# To the Peoples of Russia

POPE PIUS XII

*An Apostolic Letter dated July 7, 1952*

AS THE Holy Year was coming to a successful close, when, by divine disposition, it had been given Us to define solemnly the Dogma of the Assumption, soul and body, into heaven of the great Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, very many persons from all parts of the world expressed to Us their heartfelt joy. Among these there were some who, in sending Us letters of thanks, pleaded with insistence that We should consecrate the entire Russian people, in the difficulties of the present moment, to the Immaculate Heart of the same Virgin Mary.

This request was exceedingly acceptable to Us, because, if Our paternal affection embraces all peoples, it is directed in an especial manner to those who, though for the most part separated from this Apostolic See as a result of the vicissitudes of history, retain nevertheless the Christian name, and find themselves in such conditions that not only do they find it extremely difficult to hear Our voice and know the teachings of Catholic doctrine, but they are being compelled by guileful and evil wiles to reject even the Faith and the very idea of God.

As soon as We had been raised to the Supreme Pontificate, Our thoughts turned to you, who constitute an immense people, so greatly renowned in history for glorious undertakings, for love of your fatherland, for industriousness and thrift, for piety toward God and the Virgin Mary. We have never ceased to raise Our supplications to God that He may always assist you with His heavenly light and with His divine aid, and that He would grant each and every one of you to enjoy, together with just and reasonable material prosperity, that liberty also through which every one of you may be in a position to safeguard your human dignity, know the teachings of true religion and give due worship to God, not only in the inner sanctuary of your own conscience, but also openly, in the exercise of public and private life.

Besides, you are well aware that, whenever a possibility was offered, Our predecessors held nothing dearer than to show you their benevolence and extend to you their aid. You know that the Apostles of the Western Slavs, Saints Cyril and Methodius, who brought civilization, also, together with the Christian religion, to the ancestors of these people, directed their steps toward this city, so that the work of their apostolate might be strengthened by the authority of the Roman Pontiffs. And while they are making

their entry into Rome, Our predecessor, Adrian II of happy memory, "accompanied by the clergy and people, goes to meet them with a great display of honor"<sup>1</sup> and, after having approved and praised their work, not only raised them to the episcopate but chose to consecrate them Bishops himself, with the full solemn majesty of sacred rites.

### FRIENDLY RELATIONS

As for your forebears, the Roman Pontiffs sought, on every occasion that circumstances allowed, to enter into and consolidate friendly relations with them. Thus, in the year 977, Our predecessor, Benedict VII of happy memory, sent legates to Prince Jaropolk, brother of the famous Vladimir. And to the same great Prince Vladimir, under whose auspices the Christian name and civilization shone forth for the first time among your people, legations were sent by Our predecessors, John IV in 991 and Sylvester II in 999. This was courteously reciprocated by the same Vladimir, who, in turn, sent legates to the same Roman Pontiffs. It is worthy of note that at the time when this prince brought these peoples to the religion of Jesus Christ, Eastern and Western Christianity were united under the authority of the Roman Pontiff as supreme head of the entire Church. Furthermore, a few years later, namely in 1075, your Prince Isjaslav sent his own son Jaropolk to the Supreme Pontiff Gregory VII. And this Our predecessor of immortal memory thus wrote to this prince and his consort:

Your son, while visiting the sacred remains of the Apostles, came to us, and since he wished to receive that kingdom from our hands as a gift of St. Peter, having made a profession of fidelity to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, requested it with devout supplications, stating unhesitatingly that this request would be ratified and confirmed by you whenever he would have obtained the favor of protection by Apostolic authority. As these wishes and requests seemed lawful, both by reason of your consent and the devotion of the petitioner, we finally granted them, and we have consigned him, on behalf of St. Peter, the government of your kingdom, with this intention and this ardent desire that Blessed Peter, through his intercession with God, may guard you, your kingdom and all your affairs, and may grant you to possess that kingdom in all peace and with honor and glory to the end of your life.<sup>2</sup>

Likewise, it is to be noted and held in highest consideration that Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev, in the Ecumenical Council of Florence, added his signature to the decree by which the unity of the Eastern and Western Church, under the authority of the Roman Pontiff, was solemnly sanctioned, and this for his whole ecclesiastical province—that is, for the entire kingdom of Russia. And to this ratification of unity he, in so far as it concerned him, remained faithful until the end of his earthly life. And if in the meantime and later, by reason of a combination of adverse circumstances, communications from the one as from the other side became more difficult, and as a consequence the union of souls more difficult—although until 1448 there is no public document which declares your church separated from the Apos-

<sup>1</sup> Leo XIII, Ep. Enc. *Grande Munus*; *Acta Leonis*, II, 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Gregorii VII Registrum*, 1, 2, n. 74, in *Monum. Germ. histor.*, Epist. select. II, 1, p. 236.

tolic See—yet that, for the most part, is not to be attributed to the Slavic people nor certainly to Our predecessors, who always surrounded these people with paternal love, and when it was possible took care to sustain and aid them in every way.

We pass over not a few other historical documents from which the benevolence of Our predecessors toward your nation appears, but We cannot fail to call attention briefly to what was done by the Supreme Pontiffs Benedict XV and Pius XI, when, after the first European conflict, especially in the southern regions of your country, great multitudes of men, women, innocent boys and girls were struck by a most devastating famine and by extreme misery. They, indeed, impelled by a paternal affection for your fellow countrymen, sent to these peoples foodstuffs, clothing and a large amount of money collected from the entire Catholic world, in order to come to the aid of all those who were hungry and in distress, and to alleviate in some way their calamities.

### PUBLIC PRAYERS

Not only for their material but also for their spiritual necessities did Our predecessors seek, according to their possibilities, to provide. When, indeed, your religious situation was upset and disturbed because the enemies of God were trying to eradicate from souls faith and the very notion of a Supreme Being, they not only elevated fervent supplications to God—the Father of mercy and fount of every consolation<sup>3</sup>—but they ordained that public prayers should be offered up as well.

Thus the Supreme Pontiff Pius XI, in 1930, established that on the day of the Feast of St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, “there should be raised to God prayers in common . . . in the Vatican Basilica for the unhappy conditions of religion in Russia,”<sup>4</sup> and he himself wished to be present, surrounded by the huge and pious multitude of people. Besides, in a solemn consistorial allocution he exhorted all with these words: “It is necessary to pray to Christ . . . Redeemer of the human race, to grant that peace and liberty to profess the Faith may be restored to the afflicted people of Russia . . . and We wish that for this intention, that is for Russia, those prayers should be offered up whose recital by priest and people after Mass was ordained by Our predecessor, Leo XIII of happy memory. Let Bishops and the secular and religious clergy with all solicitude bring this to the attention of their faithful and to all those assisting at Holy Mass, and often recall it to their minds.”<sup>5</sup> We willingly confirm and renew this exhortation and this command, since the religious situation among you up to the present is certainly not improved, and since We are animated by the same most ardent affection and by the same concern for the people of Russia.

When the last long and terrible conflict broke out, We did all that was within Our power, with words, with exhortations and with action, that discords might be healed with an equitable and just peace, and that all peoples, without difference of origin, might unite in friendly and fraternal concord and work together for the attainment of a greater prosperity.

<sup>3</sup> Cfr. II Cor. 1, 3.

<sup>4</sup> *A.A.S.*, 1930, p. 300.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 301.

Never, even at that time, did there come from Our lips a word that could have seemed to any of the belligerents to be unjust or harsh. We certainly reproached, as was Our duty, every iniquity and every violation of rights, but We did this in such a way as to avoid with all diligence whatever might become, even unjustly, an occasion for the greater affliction of oppressed peoples. And when pressure was brought to bear upon Us to give Our approval in some way, either verbally or in writing, to the war undertaken against Russia in 1941, We never consented to do so, as We stated clearly on February 25, 1946, in Our allocution to the Sacred College of Cardinals and to all diplomatic representatives accredited to the Holy See.\*

### CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

When there is a question of defending the cause of religion, of truth, of justice and of Christian civilization, We certainly cannot remain silent; but Our thoughts and Our intentions have always been directed to this end: namely, that peoples be governed not by force of arms but by the majesty of the law, and that each people, enjoying civil and religious liberty within the confines of its own country, should be led toward concord, peace and that productive life whereby all citizens can procure what is necessary for their nourishment, their dwellings and for the support and upbringing of their families.

Our words and Our exhortations concerned and concern all nations, and therefore you, too, who are ever present in Our heart, and whose necessities and calamities We desire to alleviate in so far as We can. Those who love truth and not falsehood know that during the course of the recent conflict We remained impartial toward all contestants and often gave proof of Our impartiality by Our words and actions. They know also that We have embraced with Our most ardent charity all nations, even those whose rulers are professedly enemies of this Apostolic See, and those, too, in which enemies of God fiercely combat and try to erase from the minds of their citizens all that is Christian and divine.

Indeed, by command of Jesus Christ, Who entrusted the entire flock of the Christian people to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles<sup>7</sup>—whose unworthy successor We are—We love all peoples with an intense affection and We desire to promote the earthly happiness and eternal salvation of all. All, therefore, whether engaged in armed conflict with each other, or threateningly contending and menacingly disputing over their grave differences, are looked upon by us as so many very dear children; and We desire nothing more, We ask nothing more for them in our prayers to God, than mutual concord, just and true peace and ever-increasing prosperity.

And if some peoples, because deceived by lies and calumnies, profess open hostility toward Us, We cherish for them a greater pity and a more ardent love. Undoubtedly We have condemned and rejected, as the duty of Our office demands, the errors which the promoters of Atheistic Communism teach and try to propagate to the greatest detriment and misfortune of the citizens; but the persons who are in error, not only do We

\* Cfr. *A.A.S.*, 1946, p. 154.

<sup>7</sup> Cfr. Jno. 21, xv-xvii.

not turn them away, but We desire that they should return to truth and to the right path. In fact, We have unmasked and disproved those lies which were often being presented under a false semblance of truth, precisely because We cherish for you a paternal affection and seek to promote your good. For We know for certain that those errors can only cause you greatest harm, because not merely do they deprive your souls of that supernatural light and those supreme comforts which derive from piety and from the worship of God, but they rob you as well of your human dignity and of the freedom that is due to citizens.

We know that there are very many among you who still preserve their Christian faith within the innermost sanctuary of their consciences, who in no way allow themselves to be induced to help the enemies of religion, and, moreover, whose ardent desire is to profess Christian teaching—the one safe foundation of civilized life—not only in private, but if possible also openly, as becomes free men.

### MOTHER OF GOD

We know furthermore—and the knowledge has filled Our heart with hope and with deepest comfort—that you love and honor the Virgin Mother of God with ardent affection and that you venerate her sacred images. It is known that in the Kremlin itself there was constructed a church—today unfortunately no longer being used for divine worship—dedicated to Our Lady assumed into Heaven; and this is a most clear testimony of the affectionate devotion which your forebears had and you have for the Beloved Mother of God.

Now We are well aware that the hope of salvation can never be absent wherever hearts are turned with sincere and ardent piety to the most holy Mother of God. Though attempts be made by men, no matter how powerful or impious, to root out from the minds of the citizenry holy religion and Christian virtue, and though Satan himself may strive with every means to foster this sacrilegious struggle—as is described in the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities and the powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places"<sup>8</sup>—yet notwithstanding, when Mary interposes her powerful protection, the gates of hell cannot prevail. She, in fact, is the most loving and most powerful Mother of God and of us all, and never was it heard in the world that anyone has had suppliant recourse to her and has not experienced her most efficacious protection. Continue, therefore, as you have been doing, to venerate her with fervent piety, and to love her ardently and to invoke her with these words which you have been accustomed to address to her: "To you alone has it been given, O most holy and most pure Mother of God, unfaithfully to have your prayers heard."<sup>9</sup>

We, together with you, are raising to her Our suppliant invocations, that the Christian faith, which is the honor and support of human society, may

<sup>8</sup> Eph., 6, xii.

<sup>9</sup> *Acathistus Festi Patrocinii SS. Dei Genitricis*; Kondak 3.



be strengthened and increased among the peoples of Russia, and that all the wiles of the enemies of religion, all their errors and their deceptive artifices, may be driven off far from you; that public and private conduct may return to conformity with the teachings of the Gospels; that those especially who among you profess themselves as Catholics, although deprived of their pastors, may resist with fearless fortitude the assaults of the impious, if necessary even unto death; that just liberty, which is the right of the human person, of citizens and of Christians, may be restored to all as is fitting, and in the first place to the Church, which has the divine mandate of teaching to all men truth and virtue; and finally that true peace may come with its shining light to your beloved nation and to all throughout the world, and that this peace, founded securely upon justice and nourished by fraternal charity, may lead all mankind to that common prosperity of citizens and peoples which is the fruit of mutual concord.

May our most loving Mother be pleased to look with clemency also upon those who are organizing the ranks of militant atheists and upon those who are collaborating in furthering such initiatives, that she may deign to obtain for their minds that light which comes from on high and direct their hearts through divine grace unto salvation.

#### CONSECRATED TO THE IMMACULATE HEART

In order that Our and your prayers be more readily answered, and to give you an especial attestation of Our particular affection, therefore, just as not many years ago We consecrated the entire world to the Immaculate Heart of the Virgin Mother of God, in a most special way, so now We dedicate and consecrate all the peoples of Russia to that same Immaculate Heart, in confident assurance that through the most powerful protection of the Virgin Mary there may at the earliest moment be happily realized the hopes and desires which We, together with you and with all those of upright intention, have for the attainment of true peace, of fraternal concord and of rightful liberty for all: in the first place for the Church, so that through the mediation of the prayer which We raise to Heaven in union with you and with all Christian peoples, the saving Kingdom of Christ, which is "a Kingdom of truth and of life, a Kingdom of sanctity and of grace, a Kingdom of justice, of love and of peace,"<sup>10</sup> may triumph and be firmly established in every part of the world. And with suppliant appeal We pray the same most loving Mother that she may assist each and every one of you in the present calamitous circumstances and obtain from her Divine Son heavenly light for your minds, and for your souls that virtue and fortitude by which, with sustaining divine grace, you may be able victoriously to overcome impiety and error.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, on July 7, 1952, the Feast of Saints Cyril and Methodius, in the fourteenth year of Our Pontificate,

PIUS PP XII

<sup>10</sup> Praef. in festo I Ch. Regis.

# On Religious Vocations

POPE PIUS XII

*An address by His Holiness to 700 Mothers General and other Sisters attending the first International Congress of the Superiors General of Orders and Congregations of women, September 15, 1952.*

**WE** EXTEND our paternal greeting to you, beloved daughters, who have come in such large numbers to the International Congress of the Superiors General of Orders and Congregations of women, and who have come to ask the blessing of the Vicar of Christ at the conclusion of your labors, at the moment of putting into action the results of your deliberations.

When the Sacred Congregation of Religious proposed to Us to call this Congress, We considered it necessary to give the matter serious thought. In fact, an undertaking of international character such as this always requires considerable expense of time, money and personal effort. It was necessary, nevertheless, to admit its need, or, at any rate, its great usefulness. We did not judge it necessary, indeed, to withhold our approval of the reasons offered, and the imposing assembly here before Our eyes, your own countenances, your entire attitude, assure Us that during these days an immense body of good-will has been put in motion.

Yes, beloved daughters, the echoes of the Congress just concluded have proclaimed the seriousness with which you regard the service of God and how much you desire to labor for your religious families and for the Church. For this reason you wish to hear from Us a word of comfort, of encouragement and some guiding directions.

Exactly a year ago, We treated in detail a series of questions concerning the right ordering of the Orders and Congregations engaged in education and their adequate adaptation to the present situation. A certain number, if not the greater part, of the directions We gave at that time apply also to all other congregations of religious women. The experience of the past year prompts Us to call your attention to the directives which We formulated at that time. We ask you to conform courageously every time that your Sisters and your own proper experience tell you that the moment has come to take into account, with intelligence, present-day forms of life.

We have a most special reason for speaking to you in this manner. You know that the Orders of women are passing through a very serious crisis: We refer to the decrease in the number of vocations. This crisis, to be sure, has not yet reached all countries, and furthermore, where it is felt, its intensity is not everywhere the same. But even now in a certain number of European countries it gives rise to definite anxiety. In some places, where twenty years ago women's religious life was in full flower, the number of vocations has been reduced by half. And yet, in the past serious difficulties obstructed the vocation of girls, while in our own time external conditions seem to drive them toward religious life to such an extent that it would seem that it should put us on guard concerning possible unsure vocations.

We do not wish to deal in detail with this crisis, which gives Us such serious preoccupation. Another circumstance will give Us the occasion for that. Today We wish to address Ourselves only to those who—priests or laymen, preachers, orators or writers—no longer have a word of approval or praise for virginity vowed to Christ; who, notwithstanding the admonitions of the Church and contrary to her thought, have over a long period of years given to matrimony a preference in principle over virginity; who extend themselves even to the point of presenting it as the only means capable of assuring to the human personality its development and its natural perfection.

Let those who speak and write in this way be fully aware of their responsibility before God and the Church. It is necessary to place them among those who are principally guilty of a fact of which We can only speak with sorrow; while today more than ever appeals for Catholic Sisters are echoing in the Christian world and everywhere outside it, with deep regret We find Ourselves constrained to give a negative answer; at times it has even been necessary to abandon existing works, such as hospitals and educational institutions, and all because vocations are no longer sufficient to the needs.

As for yourselves, here are Our recommendations: in this crisis of vocations take care that the customs, the kind of life or the growth of your religious families do not constitute a barrier or a cause of failure. We refer to certain usages which, if at one time they had meaning in another cultural frame, no longer have it today, and in which a truly good and courageous girl would find nothing but obstacles to her own vocation. We gave various examples of this in Our discourse last year. To return, in a word, to the question of clothing: the religious habit must always express consecration to Christ; it is this which everyone expects and wants. For the rest, let the habit be appropriate and correspond to the needs of hygiene. We could only express Our satisfaction when, during the past year, We were able to see that one or two congregations had already arrived at some practical conclusions in this matter. In synthesis, in these things which are not essential, adapt yourselves to the extent that reason and well-ordered charity counsel.

## TWO EXHORTATIONS

Having said this, beloved daughters, We now offer you two pressing exhortations:

1. *A maternal affection in the direction of your Sisters.* Without doubt, it is true, as psychology holds, that the woman vested with authority does not succeed as easily as man in dispensing exactly and balancing severity and kindness. All the more reason for cultivating your maternal affection. Remember well that the vows have required a great sacrifice of your Sisters as well as of yourselves. They have renounced family, the happiness of marriage and the intimacy of the fireside: a sacrifice of great price, of importance for the apostolate of the Church, but always a sacrifice. Those of your Sisters whose spirit is more noble and refined feel this detachment in the most profound way. The word of Christ, "No one, having put his hands to the plow and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God," finds here its integral application, and that is true also today, without exception.

But the Order must, as far as possible, take the place of the family, and you, Superiors General, are called in the first place to inject the warmth of family affections into the common life of the Sisters.

Thus you must be maternal in your external comportment, in your words and your writings, even if, at times, you must dominate. But, above all, be so in your intimate thoughts, in your judgments and, as far as possible, in your sensibilities. Ask every day of Mary, the Mother of Jesus and our Mother, that She teach you to be maternal.

2. *The formation of your Sisters for the work and the duty which is theirs.* And here, show no narrowness, but be broad of vision. Whether it be a matter of education, pedagogy, care of the sick, of artistic activity or something else, the Sister must have this feeling: my superior gives me a training which places me on a level of equality with my colleagues in the world. Give them also the possibility of keeping their professional capacities up-to-date. We developed this aspect, too, last year, but We repeat it for the purpose of underlining the importance of this need to the internal peace and activity of your Sisters.

You have come, beloved daughters, from all parts of the world, near and far. Tell your Sisters that We thank them for their prayers, of which We have such great need; for their good example, which so powerfully helps so many Catholics and which leads toward the Church so many of those who do not belong to her; for their work in the service of youth, of the sick and poor, in the missions and in so many other ways—all priceless for the growth and extension of the Kingdom of God among souls. Tell your Sisters that We have a great affection for them, that their worries are Our worries and their joys Our joys, that above all We wish for them the double strength of courage and patience in the work of their personal perfection and for the apostolate which their Divine Master and Spouse has assigned to them.

As a token of Our paternal benevolence and as a pledge of the grace and of the triumphant love of the Divine Heart, We extend to you, beloved daughters, to your Sisters and to your labors Our Apostolic Benediction.



### *The Christian Story*

There are 457,300,000 members of the Catholic Church scattered throughout the world. Back of such cold figures is a long record of sacrifices and prayer. Twenty centuries of effort in spreading the teachings of Jesus Christ have brought the total to such an impressive figure. During all those eras the story has always been one of persecution and sacrifice. It could not be otherwise. Did not Our Lord tell us that we cannot expect to be His followers unless we take up the Cross behind Him? But when the going seemed most difficult, when the struggling Church seemed to be bleeding most profusely from the arrows of her enemies, it was then that the seed of future glories was being put into the ground.—CATHOLIC TIMES, Columbus, Ohio, Mar. 6, 1953.

# Persecution in Yugoslavia

*Memorial by the Catholic Union of Great Britain to Her Majesty's Government regarding Marshal Tito's visit to the United Kingdom, March 2, 1953.*

1. The Catholic Union of Great Britain has received many spontaneous and strongly worded representations from Catholic bodies in the United Kingdom regarding the forthcoming visit of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to this country. It shares the anxiety expressed by these bodies and desires to bring the widespread feeling on this subject to the attention of Her Majesty's Government. It is not the purpose of this memorial to protest against the Marshal's visit. While there are many who would have preferred that the invitation should not have been issued, the Catholic Union does not wish to question the policy of Her Majesty's Government in seeking to improve Anglo-Yugoslav relations. But British Catholics are keenly concerned over the fate of their fellow Catholics, and their fellow Christians, in Yugoslavia, and consider it essential that the Marshal's visit to England should not be interpreted as implying any kind of condonation by Her Majesty's Government of his oppressive anti-religious policy.

2. The persecution of the Christian religion, whether Catholic or Orthodox, in Yugoslavia is well known. It is administrative rather than legislative in character, and the complaint of Catholics is not only against Yugoslav law but even more against the way in which the law is interpreted and applied—or not applied. The Yugoslav constitution provides, in article 25, for "religious freedom" and there is indeed freedom of religious rites. But there is in fact no real freedom of religious life or religious conscience. We have ample evidence of this from many sources, but would in particular quote the letter addressed by the Catholic Bishops of Yugoslavia to Marshal Tito last September. In this letter the Bishops draw particular attention to the atheistic basis of all education and of all public life in Yugoslavia. "Atheism," they record, "is taught in the schools, preached in conferences, propagated in the Press, enforced on employes and on the Army. Teachers in the schools are formally forbidden to frequent the churches. Teachers who do not obey are dismissed. In a State employe, religious belief is a fatal bar. Officers of the Army dare not even have their children baptized. School children are summoned if they attend a church on Sunday, and, although physical punishment is officially prohibited in schools, children in villages have been severely beaten by their teachers for having dared to hear Mass or take part in the religious instruction of the Church." We consider that this systematic attempt to prevent the coming generation from growing up with Christian beliefs is the most serious and disturbing feature of the whole situation.

3. But the persecution goes much further, and we are prepared, if necessary, to quote further evidence. The arbitrary imprisonment and execution of great numbers of priests, the persistent administrative measures

against those who remain, the obstacles put in the way of Yugoslav Catholics to prevent them from maintaining their solidarity with their fellow Catholics in other countries (e.g. in preventing them from receiving gifts from American Catholics) or their connection in spiritual matters with the Holy See, are facts which cannot be seriously disputed. We only quote them to show that our feelings on this question are based on solid grounds, and that our protests cannot be met by easy assertions that there is no law against religion and that there is, in fact, no attack on the Christian Churches in Yugoslavia.

4. This persecution and these attacks against the Catholic and Christian population of Yugoslavia are particularly repugnant to the Catholic and Christian population of this country and the Commonwealth, and indeed to all English-speaking Catholics. The Catholic population of the Commonwealth amounts to very many millions, including several millions in the United Kingdom. The Catholic population of the United States amounts to some thirty millions. We believe that they are all united in the strongest condemnation of the anti-Christian policy of the Yugoslav Government, and that their feelings on this subject—unless the Yugoslav Government adopt a more tolerant attitude—may well increase the difficulties of bringing about a genuinely friendly understanding between Yugoslavia and the English-speaking world.

5. Our main concern, however, is not merely to ensure that Her Majesty's Government, and Marshal Tito himself, may be fully informed of the feelings of the Christian and Catholic population of this country and of the Commonwealth. It is far more to seek to bring about some alleviation of the lot of our persecuted fellow-Christians in a country once so well known for its love of freedom. We do not believe that any relaxation of the Yugoslav Government's anti-Christian policy could impair the unity of the Yugoslav State, any more than the religious freedom and toleration which exist in this country have brought about any division in the British national unity.

6. We therefore ask that Her Majesty's Government should do all in their power to bring home to Marshal Tito how much harm his present anti-Christian and oppressive policy is causing to the reputation of the Yugoslav Government with large sections of public opinion in this and other free countries, and how valuable a contribution a relaxation of that policy would make to the development of that closer understanding between the British and the Yugoslav peoples which is obviously so desirable.

7. In submitting this memorial to Her Majesty's Government, the Catholic Union are speaking not only for themselves, and for their Scottish Committee, but also for the following nineteen Catholic national organizations which have asked the Catholic Union to represent their views to Her Majesty's Government: The Catenian Association; the Catholic Education Council; the Catholic Social Guild; the Catholic Teachers' Federation; the Catholic Truth Society; the Catholic Young Men's Society of Great Britain; the Catholic Women's League; the Catholic Marriage Advisory Council; the Catholic Council for Polish Welfare; the Crusade of Rescue; the Guild of St. Luke and of Saints Cosmas and Damian; the Guild of Catholic Pro-

fessional Social Workers; the Knights of St. Columba; the Newman Association; the National Board of Catholic Women; the Sword of the Spirit; the Union of Catholic Mothers; the Union of Catholic Students; the Young Christian Workers. In addition, a number of local Catholic Parents' and Electors' Associations have asked to be associated with our representations.



### *Utility of the Humanities*

Our civilization is very old, very broad; we Americans are only a very young, very small part of it. Its essentials, its truth and its beauty, together with a deep understanding of human nature, are transmitted more through the humanities than through that up-to-date journalism of the academic world, the courses in current politics, economics and other uselessly "useful" techniques. Not that the latter are unworthy—call them the Good Housekeeping of American education—but they happen not to be the main value-transmitters and insight-transmitters. Values and insights are transmitted by saturating yourself in the Elizabethan and Greek plays, the Aeneid and the Song of Roland, the poetry of Dante and Holderlin, the amazing psychological insight of Augustine, Pascal, and the nineteenth-century Russian novelists; above all by saturating yourself in the great Christian heritage of the West.—*Peter Viereck in THOUGHT, New York, N. Y., Winter, 1952-53.*



### THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.